United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 2020 *No. 9*

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we whisper our prayer boldly before Your throne of grace. You have invited us to come to You with all our needs. We thank You for our requests that You have already answered. We have sought and found. We have knocked and walked through open doors.

Lord, with Your grace and mercy, strengthen our lawmakers for their journey. Prepare them for the ravages of the valley and the chill of the mountain summits. Guide them, great Redeemer. They are pilgrims on this Earth. They are weak, but You are mighty. Inspire them to keep their eyes on You and not the problems that seem too difficult to solve.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 1 minute in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, when President Obama signed the Iran deal, we were led to believe that this rapprochement with the Iranian regime would induce Iran to moderate its aggressive foreign policy and that Iran would likely spend the money made available through that deal on economic development for the good of its people. Instead, under the direction of General Soleimani, Iran accelerated its effort at regional domination, funding terrorist organizations like Hamas and Hezbollah in the Palestinian territories and Lebanon, pro-Iranian militias in Iraq, the Assad regime in Syria, and the Houthi rebels fomenting civil war in Yemen. Iran did all of that with money from the Iran agreement.

Meanwhile, the suffering Iranian people staged widespread demonstrations against their government, which were met with a violent crackdown that killed hundreds. Years of appeasement didn't work, but it looks like President Trump's deterrence is having positive effect.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today it appears that the House Democrat majority will finally stand behind its decision to impeach the President of the United States. Last year, the House of Representatives rushed through the least thorough and most unclear impeachment inquiry in American history. They took just 12 weeks—12 weeks.

There was more than a year of hearings before the impeachment of President Nixon. There were multiple years of investigation for President Clinton. When people are serious about compiling evidence and proving a case, these things take time.

That is not what happened this time. House Democrats performed a pale imitation of a real inquiry. They did not pursue their own subpoenas through the courts. They declined to litigate potential questions of privilege. They pulled the plug as soon as Speaker PELOSI realized she had enough Democrat votes to achieve a political outcome.

This isn't really about Ukraine policy or military assistance money. It can't be because, for one thing, prominent Democrats were promising to impeach President Trump years—years—before those events even happened.

The day this President was inaugurated, the Washington Post said: ''The campaign to impeach President Trump has begun.'' That was the day he was inaugurated, stated in the Washington Post.

More than 2 years ago, Congressman JERRY NADLER was campaigning to be the top Democrat on the House Judiciary Committee, specifically because he was an impeachment expert.

Just a few weeks ago, when a reporter asked Speaker PELOSI why the Democrats were in such a hurry, here is her response:

Speed? It's been going on for 22 months. Two and a half years, actually.

That is really interesting—really, really interesting. The events over which the Democrats want to impeach happened just 6 months ago—just 6 months ago—not 2½ years ago.

So how has impeachment been underway for 2½ years? The Speaker tried to say she was referring to the Mueller investigation, except the House couldn't impeach on the Mueller investigation because the facts let them down; remember?

The House impeached over events in Ukraine, events that happened only 6 months ago, but they still admit this was years in the making. It was not some earnest factfinding mission that brought us to where we are. This is not about the nuances of foreign assistance to Eastern Europe. This has been naked partisanship all along—naked partisanship all along.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

If that weren't already obvious, our colleague the Senate Democratic leader helpfully removed any shred of doubt just this past weekend. Here is what he said: He told reporters that as long as he can try to use the trial to hurt some Republican Senators' reelection chances, then whatever happens, ''it's a win-win.'' That is what the Democratic leader said. This is a stunning statement.

Presidential impeachment may be the gravest process our Constitution contemplates. It undoes the people's decision in a national election. Going about it in this subjective, unfair, and rushed way is corrosive to our institutions. It hurts national unity, and it virtually guarantees—guarantees—that future Houses of either party will feel free—free—to impeach any future President because they don't like him. If you don't like him, impeach him. That is the message coming out of this.

But as long as our colleague the Democratic leader can weaponize this process in the next election, he thinks ''it's a win-win.'' That really says it all; doesn't it? That really sums it up.

This partisanship led House Democrats to cross a rubicon that every other House of Representatives had avoided for 230 years. They passed the first Presidential impeachment that does not even allege an actual crime under our laws. We had a 230-year tradition of rejecting purely political impeachments, and it died last month in this House of Representatives.

So Speaker PELOSI and the House have taken our Nation down a dangerous road. If the Senate blesses this unprecedented and dangerous House process by agreeing that an incomplete case and a subjective basis are enough to impeach a President, we will almost guarantee the impeachment of every future President of either party when the House doesn't like that President.

This grave process of last constitutional resort will be watered down into the kind of anti-democratic recall measure that the Founding Fathers explicitly—explicitly—did not want.

The Senate was designed to stabilize our institutions, to break partisan fevers, and to stop short-term passions from destroying our long-term future. House Democrats may have descended into pure factionalism, but the U.S. Senate must not.

This is the only body that can consider all factors presented by the House, decide what has or has not been proven, and choose what outcome best serves the Nation. This is what we must do.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, with the House signaling that they will move forward later today, Members can expect to receive further guidance about the logistics and practicalities of the next several session days in short order.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on an entirely different matter, before the Senate shifts into the trial, we hope to complete an enormous accomplishment for this administration and, most importantly, for American families. It has now been more than 1 year—1 year—since President Trump hammered out the USMCA with the Governments of Mexico and Canada.

These two neighbors buy more than $5 billion of American goods and services every single year. They buy nearly 30 percent of all the food and agricultural products we export to the entire world, and for 90 percent of our manufacturing sectors, Mexico or Canada rank as the No. 1 or No. 2 export destination.

Over the past quarter of a century, 12 million U.S. jobs have come to depend on U.S. trade with Mexico and Canada. That includes many livelihoods in my home State of Kentucky, from agriculture to manufacturing, to aerospace and motor vehicles, to our signature industries, like distilled spirits.

That is why workers, families, and small businesses in Kentucky and around the Nation have been clamoring to get this deal done for a year now. In addition to all the American livelihoods that this commerce already supports, experts predict the USMCA will create 176,000 new jobs as well.

On behalf of all of these Americans, we were troubled to see Speaker PELOSI slow walk this agreement for the better part of a year. But, finally, late last year, the overwhelming bipartisan pressure to move forward made an impact on the House. So we are finally on the threshold of approving this agreement and sending it to President Trump's desk to become law.

Our colleagues on the Finance Committee have already approved it by an overwhelming margin. Other committees of jurisdiction are wrapping up their consideration as we speak. Very soon, we hope the Senate will be able to vote on the floor and put this landmark accomplishment right on the President's desk.

It will be a major win for Kentucky and for all 50 States, a major win for our country, a major win for the Trump administration, and a major win for those of us who are already ready to move past this season of toxic political noise and get back to doing even more of the American people's business.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 3193

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3193) to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, before I make remarks on a different issue, I would like to address comments made this morning by the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky. The first related, as most of his comments recently, to the pending impeachment trial in the U.S. Senate.

I listened carefully to his arguments that the House and the Senate have moved too quickly on this matter. It is true that they moved with dispatch, and I think it reflects the fact that the charges that have been made were timely, important, and relevant to the election campaign cycle which we now face.

The charges in the Articles of Impeachment suggest the President, in conversation with the President of Ukraine, asked for help in the campaign that is about to ensue, asking specifically for investigative material on the son of former Vice President Joseph Biden. At the same time, the President was withholding military assistance voted by the Appropriations Committee in Congress to Ukraine as they continue to battle with Russia. These are serious charges, and they were based on a telephone conversation last July.

It is true that the effort by the House of Representatives has been timely and, by measurement of previous impeachment investigations, much faster, but I believe that the timeliness is one of the important elements here because we are facing this campaign.

Secondly, there was an argument made by the majority leader that the Articles of Impeachment which we are about to receive in the Senate do not state that a crime was committed. I would refer the majority leader to the Constitution as well as to precedent in the U.S. Senate. The actual allegation of a crime is not required for an impeachment. I think the Senator from Kentucky knows that.

The last point he makes is one that I think is very important, and that is that there has been some delay by Speaker PELOSI in sending the Articles of Impeachment to the U.S. Senate. I would say, during the course of the period since they were first voted on last December in the House and their arrival in the Senate this week, we have seen several things of importance unfold, not the least of which was a recent disclosure of new witnesses and new evidence that has have been collected since the House voted on the Articles of Impeachment. In the eyes of many, it is relevant evidence, and the fact that that information is now available to the Senate means we have a better chance of arriving at the truth after deliberation.

Secondly, I might add it is encouraging that some Republican Members of the U.S. Senate have made it clear that they oppose the notion of a motion to dismiss the impeachment charges as soon as they arrive. That might have been the dream of some in the White House—and perhaps even some in the U.S. Senate—but cooler heads have prevailed, and I salute my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who believe we have a special responsibility to treat this constitutional assignment with independence and dignity. That means we don't prejudge by coming to the floor and announcing, in some critical terms, that the Articles of Impeachment should not be taken seriously. We should take them seriously. It is a serious matter. I hope colleagues on both sides of the aisle will do that.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, also addressed the USMCA. This is characterized as the NAFTA–2 or ''the new trade agreement'' between the United States, Canada, and Mexico. As he noted, trade among our three countries is critically important to all of us and, certainly, to the American economy and to my home State of Illinois. Our trade with Mexico and Canada eclipses all the other trade around the world and is important, especially, to our agricultural sector.

Just last weekend, in my hometown of Springfield, IL, I held a historic press conference. I brought together the President of the Illinois State AFL–CIO, Tim Drea of Christian County in Central Illinois, and Dick Guebert, who is the president of the Illinois Farm Bureau, both of whom, through their organizations, support the USMCA trade agreement that is about to come before Congress. There were a lot of smiles and laughter in the room as these two friends of mine noted that it is the very first time they have ever come together at a press conference: organized labor and the farmers of the State of Illinois. They both agree that this USMCA trade agreement is a step forward, an improvement over the original NAFTA. They both endorse it, and I do too.

I also want to add that the suggestion that somehow Speaker PELOSI, in the words of the majority leader, slow-walked the USMCA really, in a way, ignores the obvious. In the period of time between the original submission of the USMCA and the vote that will take place soon in the U.S. Senate, changes have been made to the trade agreement which the President submitted to Congress—important changes. For example, there was a provision in the trade agreement submitted by the President to Congress that was a dream come true for the pharmaceutical industry of the United States. It extended the period of time of exclusivity for certain biological drugs in that treaty. What it meant was that these pharmaceutical companies could continue to charge the highest prices on Earth to American consumers while delaying any competition from generic drugs.

That was a deal-breaker, as far as I was concerned. I told everyone involved I would not support the President's original USMCA with that sweetheart deal for the pharmaceutical industry. Thank goodness, because of Speaker PELOSI; our leader on the Senate side, Senator SCHUMER; and many others, we had that provision removed. Now the majority leader is criticizing Speaker PELOSI for slow-walking. I don't see it as slow-walking. I see it as bargaining, negotiating, and coming up with the result which made this trade agreement more acceptable to people on both sides of the aisle.

There was also language which the Democrats insisted on ultimately included in the USMCA, which provides additional protection for workers in the United States when it comes to the competition with workers in Mexico and Canada, which provides for additional inspections of production facilities in those other countries if there is a suspicion that they are engaging in the treatment of workers in an unacceptable manner. In other words, we put more enforcement provisions in the treaty over the last year while it has been before Congress, as we should—exactly what the American people want. For the Senator to come to the floor and criticize this as somehow negative and political and slow-walking—I think those two things I have just mentioned are substantive and important and go to the heart of why this agreement now has strong bipartisan support, which it should have had. I think we have added to this process by making it truly bipartisan.

FOR-PROFIT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this week the House of Representatives will have the opportunity to stand up for student borrowers who have been defrauded by the schools they attended. The House of Representatives will be voting on a resolution introduced by Representative SUSIE LEE of Nevada which will allow defrauded student loan borrowers relief from their student debt.

Under the Higher Education Act, currently the law of the land, when a student borrower is defrauded by their school, they are entitled to have their Federal student loans to attend that school discharged. That is what Congress intended. Why? The logic behind it is very straightforward.

Consider the following: The Federal Government recognizes the accreditation of these schools, colleges, and universities. That accreditation authorizes these schools to offer loans from the Federal Government to pay for the cost of attending. It is a very straightforward process. The schools are accredited. The U.S. Government recognizes the accreditation which authorizes the school to offer courses to students, and then it goes on to say that students attending those colleges and universities will qualify for Federal student loans. Now, that is where this particular statement I am about to make becomes particularly relevant.

The school makes promises about the education they are going to offer to the students to entice them to attend and to borrow money to attend. For example, the school may tell the students that the credits they earn at this school can be transferred to other schools, but sometimes that turns out to be untrue and false. These schools may tell the students there are jobs waiting for them in the fields that they want them to study at the schools. They tell them that, after graduation, there are plenty of employment opportunities, and oftentimes that turns out to be untrue. In fact, in the case of some of these schools, they have deliberately misrepresented the job placement of graduates to create the impression of success if you complete a course. The schools are lying to the students.

The school may also promise that, if you complete a course at the school, you will automatically be qualified for certain certifications under State law. Sometimes that turns out to be a lie. They may also tell the students there are certain teachers and courses available to them if they pay their tuition, and that may turn out to be untrue as well.

The law I referred to earlier is intended, when these types of lies and misrepresentations occur and the student is misled into borrowing Federal student loans based on these misrepresentations, to give the defrauded student the right to be relieved of the student loan responsibility under the law.

It makes sense. If the student is lied to, takes out a Federal loan, and it turns out the school lied to them and defrauded them, we don't want the students saddled with a loan from that school that could literally change their lives.

Now we have a new Secretary of Education under President Trump, Betsy DeVos. She has decided to rewrite the rules when it comes to these students receiving relief from the fraud I have just described. She places burdens on these students that we have not seen before. Basically, she is saying to the students: Lawyer up. You just can't make your plea to the Department of Education that you, along with a group of other students, were defrauded by representations in the materials they distributed or the statements they made—not good enough under the new rule written by Secretary DeVos. What she has basically said is that each one of these students now has an individual responsibility to prove that that student was defrauded, that there was a representation to that student as opposed to it being made by the school to all of the students or in its publications and the like.

The burdens which Secretary DeVos now places on defrauded students have led to estimates that only 3 percent of the students who have been defrauded can possibly expect to receive relief from their student debt—3 percent. You might say: Well, these things happen. It is a ''buyer beware'' market. Students ought to know better. Really?

When the Federal Government recognizes an accredited school and says to that school: You can offer Federal student loans, do we not bear some responsibility to the student and the family if that school lies and misrepresents facts to the students? Well, 78 percent of Americans happen to think, yes, we don't want to have students in a predicament where their own futures are going to be somehow compromised because of the fraud by the school.

How many students are affected by this? A handful? No. It turns out, a dramatically large number. Over the last decade, tens of thousands of college students in America have been defrauded in ways I just described, lured into enrolling in classes with false promises and aggressive tactics, only to be left with massive student debt and a worthless education and no job. Sadly, it is a common occurrence in the for-profit college industry. That industry, the for-profit college industry, is an industry that can be best described by two numbers. Nine percent of postsecondary students are enrolled in for-profit colleges and universities in America. Think about the University of Phoenix, DeVry, and others. Nine percent of students end up in schools like that. Yet 33 percent of all the federal student loan defaults are students from these for-profit colleges and universities—9 percent of the students, 33 percent of the student loan defaults. Why? The tuition is too high; the education is virtually worthless; and there are no jobs at the end of the rainbow.

Some of these schools—for-profit colleges like Corinthian, ITT Tech, Westwood, Dream Center—preyed on students, reaped huge profits, and then conveniently went bankrupt. They may be gone, legally gone, but the debts for the students still live. Others, such as Ashford, University of Phoenix, Career Education Corporation, are still out there doing business. Virtually, all of these notorious schools have been the subject of multiple State and local investigations or lawsuits for unfair, deceptive, and abusive practices. Unfortunately, they continue to create more student victims due to the lack of enforcement by our own U.S. Department of Education and loopholes in the laws, which, sadly, Congress has been unable or unwilling to close.

Currently, there are more than 223,000 claims made by students of being defrauded and seeking relief under the Higher Education Act—over 200,000 student borrowers whose lives have been collared by student loan debt from these worthless, defrauding schools.

The claims—223,000 of them—come from every State in the Union, big and small, red, blue, and purple. There are over 11,000 from my State of Illinois; over 19,000 from the State of Florida; 7,800 from Ohio; 6,100 from North Carolina; 3,800 from Colorado; 1,000 from the State of West Virginia; 385 in Maine; and more than 200 in Alaska.

The American people believe these defrauded student borrowers and future defrauded borrowers deserve help. According to a poll by New America, 78 percent of Americans believe students should have their Federal student loans forgiven if their schools defrauded them. That includes 87 percent of Democrats and 71 percent of Republicans who feel that way.

This new rule by Secretary DeVos would not allow borrowers to receive the Federal student loan discharge currently in the law. It is why more than 60 organizations are supporting the resolution, which the House will vote on this week, and the companion resolution I have introduced in the Senate.

Among those supporting our effort are the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, the Student Veterans of America—and one that I want to highlight.

I see there are others on the floor preparing to speak, so I am going to abbreviate my remarks, but I want to make one last point.

Among the groups supporting our efforts to undo the borrower defense rule, promulgated by Secretary of Education DeVos, is the American Legion. The American Legion sent me a letter last month, and, in support of our effort to undo the DeVos rule, they said, among other things, that the rule is fundamentally unfair to veterans. Listen to what they say about the plight of veterans having been defrauded by schools, trying to get relief from their loans. This is from James ''Bill'' Oxford, national commander of the American Legion. He writes:

Thousands of student veterans have been defrauded over the years—promised their credits would transfer when they wouldn't, given false or misleading job placement rates in marketing, promised one educational experience when they were recruited, but given something completely different. This type of deception against our veterans and servicemembers has been a lucrative scam for unscrupulous actors.

As veterans are aggressively targeted due to their service to our country, they must be afforded the right to group relief. The Department of Education's ''Borrower Defense'' rule eliminates this right.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter dated December 18, 2019.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, December 18, 2019.

Hon. RICHARD DURBIN,
Senate Dirksen Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DURBIN: On behalf of the nearly 2 million members of The American Legion, I write to express our support for Joint Resolution 56, providing for congressional disapproval of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to, ''Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability.'' The rule, as currently written, is fundamentally rigged against defrauded borrowers of student loans, depriving them of the opportunity for debt relief that Congress intended to afford them under the Higher Education Act. Affirming this position is American Legion Resolution No. 82: Preserve Veteran and Servicemember Rights to Gainful Employment and Borrower Defense Protections, adopted in our National Convention 2017.

Thousands of student veterans have been defrauded over the years—promised their credits would transfer when they wouldn't, given false or misleading job placement rates in marketing, promised one educational experience when they were recruited, but given something completely different. This type of deception against our veterans and servicemembers has been a lucrative scam for unscrupulous actors.

As veterans are aggressively targeted due to their service to our country, they must be afforded the right to group relief. The Department of Education's ''Borrower Defense'' rule eliminates this right, forcing veterans to individually prove their claim, share the specific type of financial harm they suffered, and prove the school knowingly made substantial misrepresentations. The preponderance of evidence required for this process is so onerous that the Department of Education itself estimated that only 3 percent of applicants would get relief.

Until every veteran's application for student loan forgiveness has been processed, we will continue to demand fair and timely decisions. The rule that the Department of Education has promulgated flagrantly denies defrauded veterans these dignities, and The American Legion calls on Congress to overturn this regulatory action.

Senator Durbin, The American Legion applauds your leadership in addressing this critical issue facing our nation's veterans and their families.

For God & Country,
JAMES W. ''BILL'' OXFORD,
National Commander, The American Legion.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have an additional letter from 20 State attorneys general led by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Office of the Attorney General. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter dated January 14, 2020.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Boston, MA, January 14, 2020.

Senator DICK DURBIN,
Washington, DC.
Representative SUSIE LEE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DURBIN AND REPRESENTATIVE LEE: We, the undersigned Attorneys General of Massachusetts, California, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Hawai'i, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington write to express our support for the resolution of disapproval that you have introduced regarding the U.S. Department of Education's (''Department'') 2019 Borrower Defense Rule (''2019 Rule'') pursuant to the Congressional Review Act. In issuing the 2019 Rule, the Department has abdicated its Congressionally-mandated responsibility to protect students and taxpayers from the misconduct of unscrupulous schools. The rule provides no realistic prospect for borrowers to discharge their loans when they have been defrauded by predatory for-profit schools, and it eliminates financial responsibility requirements for those same institutions. If this rule goes into effect, the result will be disastrous for students while providing a windfall to abusive schools.

The 2019 Rule squanders and reverses recent progress the Department has made in protecting students from fraud and abuse. Three years ago, the Department completed a thorough rulemaking process addressing borrower defense and financial responsibility, in which the views of numerous schools, stakeholders, and public commenters were considered and incorporated into a comprehensive set of regulations. The regulations, promulgated by the Department in November 2016 (''2016 Rule''), made substantial progress toward achieving the Department's then-stated goal of providing defrauded borrowers with a consistent, clear, fair, and transparent process to seek debt relief. At the same time, the 2016 Rule protected taxpayers by holding schools accountable that engage in misconduct and ensuring that financially troubled schools provide the government with protection against the risks they create.

The Department's new rule would simply rescind and replace its 2016 Rule, reversing all of its enhanced protections for students and its accountability measures for for-profit schools. The Department's 2019 Rule provides an entirely unfair and unworkable process for defrauded students to obtain loan relief and will do nothing to deter and hold accountable schools that cheat their students. Among its numerous flaws, the Department's new rule places insurmountable evidentiary burdens on student borrowers with meritorious claims. The rule requires student borrowers to prove intentional or reckless misconduct on the part of their schools, an extraordinarily demanding standard not consistent with state laws governing liability for unfair and deceptive conduct. Moreover, even where a school has intentionally or recklessly harmed its students, it is difficult to imagine how students would be able to obtain the evidence necessary to prove intent or recklessness for an administrative application to the Department. The rule also inappropriately requires student borrowers to prove financial harm beyond the intrinsic harm caused by incurring federal student loan debt as a result of fraud, and establishes a three-year time bar on borrower defense claims, even though students typicaJiy do not learn until years later that they were defrauded by their schools. Compounding these obstacles, the rule arbitrarily eliminates the process by which relief can be sought on a group level, permitting those schools that have committed the most egregious and systemic misconduct to benefit from their wrongdoing at the expense of borrowers with meritorious claims who are unaware of or unable to access relief.

We are uniquely well-situated to understand the devastating effects that the 2019 Rule would have on the lives of student borrowers and their families. State attorneys general serve an important role in the regulation of private, postsecondary institutions. Our investigations and enforcement actions have repeatedly revealed that numerous for-profit schools have deceived and defrauded students, and employed other unlawful tactics to line their coffers with federal student-loan funds. We have witnessed firsthand the heartbreaking devastation to borrowers and their families. Recently, for example, state attorneys general played a critical role in uncovering widespread misconduct at Career Education Corporation, Education Management Corporation, the Art Institute and Argosy schools operated by the Dream Center, ITT Technical Institute, Corinthian Colleges, American Career Institute and others, and then working with the Department to secure borrower-defense relief for tens of thousands of defrauded students. Though this work, we have spoken with numerous students who, while seeking new opportunities for themselves and their families, were lured into programs with the promise of employment opportunities and higher earnings, only to be left with little to show for their efforts aside from unaffordable debt.

A robust and fair borrower defense rule is critical for ensuring that student borrowers and taxpayers are not left bearing the costs of institutional misconduct. The Department's new rule instead empowers predatory for-profit schools and cuts off relief to victimized students. During the comment period on the 2019 Rule, we submitted these and other objections to the Department. Rather than engaging with our offices, the Department ignored our comments and left our concerns unaddressed. We commend and support your efforts to disapprove the 2019 Rule to protect students and taxpayers. Congress must hold predatory institutions accountable for their misconduct and provide relief to defrauded student borrowers and, by enacting your resolution of disapproval, ensure that the 2016 Rule remains the operative borrower defense regulation.

Sincerely,

Maurn Healey, Massachusetts Attorney General; Kathleen Jennings, Delaware Attorney General; Clare E. Connors, Hawai'i Attorney General; Tom Miller, Iowa Attorney General; Brian E. Frosh, Maryland Attorney General; Keith Ellison, Minnesota Attorney General; Hector Balderas, New Mexico Attorney General; Xavier Becerra, California Attorney General; Karl A. Racine, District of Columbia Attorney General; Kwame Raoul, Illinois Attorney General; Aaron M. Frey, Maine Attorney General; Dana Nessel, Michigan Attorney General; Gurbir S. Grewal, New Jersey Attorney General; Letitia James, New York Attorney General; Joshua H. Stein, North Carolina Attorney General; Josh Shapiro, Pennsylvania Attorney General; Mark R. Herring, Virginia Attorney General; Ellen F. Rosenblum, Oregon Attorney General; Thomas J. Donovan, Jr., Vermont Attorney General; Bob Ferguson, Washington State Attorney General.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, along with Attorney General Kwame Raoul of Illinois and others, signers include the attorneys general of Maine, Iowa, Pennsylvania, and North Carolina. In their letter, these chief state law enforcement officers write:

> In issuing the 2019 rule, the Department has abdicated its Congressionally-mandated responsibility to protect students and taxpayers from the misconduct of unscrupulous schools. The rule provides no realistic prospect for borrowers to discharge their loans when they have been defrauded by predatory for-profit schools . . . if this rule goes into effect, the result will be disastrous for students while providing a windfall to abusive schools.

Senators are going to get a chance—Democrats and Republicans—to undo the mess created by the Secretary of Education. Senators will get a chance to stand up for the student loan borrowers who have been defrauded and, equally important, a chance to stand up for our veterans. How many speeches have been delivered on this floor about the men and women in uniform and those who have served and how much we honor them? Honor them by standing with the American Legion and vote to undo the borrower defense rule of Secretary DeVos.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The majority whip.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, later today, the President will sign phase one of the trade agreement we are negotiating with China. Of particular importance to my State, phase one includes a pledge from China to substantially increase its imports of American agriculture products.

That is good news for South Dakota. It is good news for farmers and ranchers who have been struggling in a tough ag economy. Low commodity and livestock prices, natural disasters, and protracted trade disputes have made the last few years challenging ones for farmers and ranchers around the country.

I spend a lot of time in South Dakota, talking to our farmers and ranchers. One thing they always emphasize is the need for trade deals that will open up new markets or expand current markets for their products.

The China deal should significantly increase demand for American agricultural products and boost the farm economy. But while this agreement is excellent news, we do need to make sure that China will actually live up to its commitments. China doesn't have

the best record in this regard, so it is important the United States make clear that any agreements must be honored.

As we wait for the China deal to take effect, one piece of definite good news on the trade front is the arrival in the Senate of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement. After months of delay by House Democrats, USMCA is finally—finally—moving through Congress. Here in the Senate, it is advancing rapidly through the required committees, and I expect it will be received for final Senate consideration in the next few days.

Last week, I voted in support of this agreement in the Senate Finance Committee, and just this morning—a few minutes ago, in fact—I voted for this agreement in a meeting of the Senate Committee on Commerce. The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement has been a big priority of mine over the past year, in particular because of the ways the agreement would benefit farmers and ranchers.

Canada and Mexico are the No. 1 and No. 2 markets for American agriculture products, and this agreement will preserve and expand farmers' access to these two critical export markets and give farmers certainty about what these markets are going to look like going forward.

I am particularly pleased about the ways that USMCA will benefit dairy farmers. If you drive the I–29 corridor north of Brookings, SD, you can see firsthand the major dairy expansion South Dakota has experienced over the past several years.

The U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement will preserve U.S. dairy farmers' role as a key dairy supplier to Mexico, and it will substantially expand market access to Canada. The U.S. International Trade Commission estimates that the agreement will boost U.S. dairy exports by more than $277 million. The agreement will also expand market access for U.S. poultry and egg producers. It will make it easier for American producers to export wheat to Canada and much more.

Of course, the benefits of this agreement are not limited to farmers and ranchers. The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement will benefit virtually every sector of the economy, from manufacturing to digital services to the automotive industry. It will create hundreds of thousands of new jobs, boost our economic output, and increase wages for workers.

The agreement also breaks new ground by including a chapter specifically focused on small and medium-sized businesses—the first time a U.S. trade agreement has ever included a dedicated chapter on this topic.

Roughly, 120,000 small and medium-sized businesses around our country export goods and services to Mexico and Canada, including a number of businesses in my home State of South Dakota. The United States-Mexico- Canada Agreement will make it easier for these businesses to successfully export their products. South Dakota businesses and consumers will also benefit from the fact that the agreement maintains the current U.S. de minimis threshold, which is something I fought hard to protect.

It is too bad farmers and ranchers had to wait so long for the USMCA trade agreement. This agreement was concluded well over a year ago, and it could have been taken up much sooner. But House Democrats have, unfortunately, been more focused on playing political games than on working with Republicans to do the American people's business.

I am very glad we are taking up this agreement now, though, and I look forward to voting for final passage of USMCA in the very near future. We should get this agreement to the President's desk without delay.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, today is a momentous, historic, and solemn day in the history of the U.S. Senate and in the history of our Republic. The House of Representatives will send Articles of Impeachment against President Trump to the Senate, and the Speaker will appoint the House managers of the impeachment case.

Two articles will be delivered. The first charges the President with abuse of power—of coercing a foreign leader into interfering in our elections and of using the powers of the Presidency, the most powerful public office in the Nation, to benefit himself. The second charges the President with obstruction of Congress for an unprecedented blockade of the legislature's authority to oversee and investigate the executive branch.

Let's put it a different way.

The House of Representatives has accused the President of trying to shake down a foreign leader for personal gain to help him in his campaign, and he has done everything possible to cover it up. This administration is unprecedented in its not being open, in its desire for secrecy, in its desire to prevent the public from knowing what it is doing, and it is worst of all when it comes in an impeachment trial.

The two offenses are the types of offenses the Founders had in mind when they designed the impeachment powers of Congress. Americans and the Founding Fathers, in particular, from the very founding day of the Republic, have feared the ability of a foreign power to interfere in our elections. Americans have never wanted a foreign power to have sway over our elections, but that is what President Trump is accused of doing—of soliciting—in these articles.

I would ask my colleagues, and I would ask the American people: Do we want a foreign power determining who our President is or do we want the American voters to determine it? It is that serious. That is the central question: Who should determine who our President and our other elected officials are?

From the early days of the Republic, foreigners have tried to interfere, and from the early days of the Republic, we have resisted. Yet, according to these articles and other things he has done, President Trump seems to aid and abet it. His view is, if it is good for him, then, that is good enough. That is not America. We are a nation of laws—of the rule of law, not of the rule of one man.

So now the Senate's job is to try the case—to conduct a fair trial on these very severe charges of letting, aiding, abetting, and encouraging a foreign power to interfere in our elections and of threatening them with the cutoff of aid—and to determine if the President's offenses merit, if they are proven, the most severe punishment our Constitution imagines.

The House has made a very strong case, but, clearly, the Senators have to see that case and watch it firsthand. A fair trial means the prosecutors who make the case and the President's counsel who provide the defense have all of the evidence available. It means that Senators have all of the facts to make an informed decision. That means relevant witnesses, and that means relevant documents. We all know that. We all know—every Member of this body, Democrat or Republican—that you can't have a fair, open trial, particularly on something as weighty as impeachment, when we don't have the evidence and the facts.

The precedents of the Senate are clear. Leader MCCONNELL is constantly citing precedent. Here is one: The Senate has always heard from witnesses in impeachment trials. There have been 15 completed impeachment trials in the history of this country. In every single one of them, the Senate has heard from witnesses. Let me repeat that for Leader MCCONNELL's benefit since he is always citing the precedent of 1999. There have been 15 completed impeachment trials, including the one in 1999. In the history of this country, in every single one of them, the Senate has heard from witnesses. It would be unprecedented not to. President Johnson's impeachment trial had witnesses—41 of them. President Clinton's

trial had witnesses. Several of my colleagues, including the Republican leader, voted for them. Conducting an impeachment trial of the President of the United States and having no witnesses would be without precedent and, frankly, a new low for the majority in this body that history will not look kindly on.

Each day that goes by, the case for witnesses and documents gains force and gains momentum. Last night, a new cache of documents, including dozens of pages of notes, text messages, and other records, shed light on the activities of the President's associates in Ukraine. The documents paint a sordid picture of the efforts by the President's personal attorney, Rudy Giuliani, and his associate, Lev Parnas, to remove a sitting U.S. Ambassador and to pressure Ukraine President Zelensky to announce an investigation of one of the President's political rivals. Part of the plot to remove Ambassador Yovanovitch involved hiring a cheap Republican operative to follow her around and monitor her movements. How low can they go?

Just when you think that President Trump and his network couldn't possibly get any more into the muck, reports suggest they are even dirtier than you could imagine. I saw a novelist on TV this morning. He said: If I had brought this plot to my publisher, he would have rejected it. He would have said it was absurd, that it could never happen, and that people will not believe it.

Well, here it is, led by President Trump, who, again, cares not for the morals, ethics, and honor of this country as much as he cares about himself.

To allegedly have some cut-rate political operative stalk an American Ambassador at the direction of the President's lawyer, potentially with the President's ''knowledge and consent''—that is what one of the emails read—I mean, how much more can America take in the decline of our morals, our values, and our standing in the world?

I don't care who you are—Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative. Doesn't this kind of thing bother you if anyone does it, let alone the President of the United States?

I don't know how any Member of this body could pick up the newspaper this morning, read this new revelation, and not conclude that the Senate needs access to relevant documents like these in the trial of President Trump. The release of this new information dramatically underscores the need for witnesses and for documents.

The Republican leader has, so far, opposed Democratic requests to call for factfinding witnesses and to subpoena three specific sets of relevant documents. Despite their having no argument against them, the Republicans' position at the moment is to punt the question of witnesses and documents until after both sides finish their presentations. Then, they say they will consider documents and witnesses with an open mind.

The Democrats have requested four fact witnesses. They are the President's top advisers, like Mr. Mulvaney. They are not the Democrats' men. They are the President's men. They are not Democratic witnesses. They are not our witnesses. They are just witnesses, plain and simple. Each of them has firsthand information about the charges against the President.

So, as the House prepares to send the articles to the Senate today, it is time for us—all of us—to turn to the serious job of conducting a fair trial, one that the American people will accept as fair, not as a coverup and not as something that has hidden the evidence. The focus of Senators on both sides must fall on the question of witnesses and documents.

CHINA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on China, later this morning the President is expected to take part in the signing ceremony for the so-called phase 1 trade agreement with China.

Now, I have commended the President for his instincts when it has come to China. At one point, his instincts were to be strong and tough. I have compared his stances previously to those of previous administrations. I was rooting for the President to succeed for the sake of jobs and wealth and the economy in this country, and I told him that personally. So this phase 1 deal is an extreme disappointment to me and to millions and millions of Americans who want to see us make China play fairly. President Trump's phase 1 trade deal with China is a historic blunder. Several harmful policies and practices are reportedly unaddressed.

First, there appear to be no commitments to end China's subsidy program that continues to hurt U.S. industries and workers at all levels.

Second, there appear to be no commitments to reform the Chinese policy of state-owned enterprises, which unfairly compete with American enterprises and take American jobs away while they are allowed to freely sell here and while our best companies can't sell there.

Third, there appear to be no commitments to curtail the illegal dumping of Chinese products into our markets, which puts American firms out of business and workers out of jobs.

Fourth, glaringly, there appear to be no significant commitments to definitely end China's predatory and flagrant cyber theft of American intellectual property, which has stolen a generation of American jobs and American wealth.

Fifth, concerning what the deal achieves in terms of agricultural purchases, it appears the Trump administration has not addressed the fact that China has existing contracts with countries like Brazil and Argentina. It doesn't need any more of our products, certainly not in the numbers that have been talked about, and the agreement does not grapple with the fact that American farmers have already lost billions, have watched their markets disappear, and have gone bankrupt in the time it has taken the President to reach the deal.

Reading the reporting of phase one of the trade deal feels like watching a bad rerun of the past 10 years of botched trade negotiations with China. I fear that President Xi is laughing at us behind our backs for having gained so much at our expense. The United States concedes our leverage, and in exchange, China makes vague, unenforceable promises it never intends to fulfill. We have seen this over and over again. China agrees to something, and they don't do it.

President Trump complained about President Obama and President Bush and others when they signed these deals and nothing happened, and he is doing the same darn thing—the same darn thing. It is no wonder they haven't made it public. They are afraid that when people actually read it, they will see that it is not good for America and that the Chinese took us hook, line, and sinker.

If I sound frustrated and angry, it is because I am. Even today, an hour before the deal is signed by the President, I have to use phrases like ''appear to'' and ''according to reports'' because the administration has shrouded the details of the agreement in secrecy and kept the text of the deal under lock and key. The Trump administration doesn't want the details of the agreement to come out before they can spin it because it knows that once the details come out, everyone will see that China has taken President Trump to the cleaners. President Trump, the great negotiator, has been totally outnegotiated by President Xi.

Just like on impeachment, the President and his team are afraid of the truth. They don't want anyone to see the facts or the truth; they just want to spin. If the Trump administration were proud of this deal, they would hold it up to the world and shout it from the mountaintops. Instead, they have kept it hidden. They want to spin it, but they can't spin away the fact that this deal is a bad deal for American workers, American companies, American jobs, and American wealth. Even today—the day the agreement will be signed—we have been told we may not get all the details.

Given the absurd secrecy surrounding President Trump's phase one trade deal, I expect that once everyone gets to take a look at it in the light of day, they will find that the administration has signed one of the most tragically one-sided agreements in recent memory.

Even the farmers—President Trump sold out the structural changes to try to help the farmers—when they look at the specifics, they are going to see that

they are a lot less than meets the eye and that our farmers will continue to suffer.

It was an opportunity to secure real reforms to China's rapacious trade and industrial policy. President Trump may have just squandered it indefinitely—a severe and potentially irreparable loss for the American people, American businesses, American workers.

Given how poorly trade deal one was executed with China, I have virtually no faith that trade deal two, if it ever comes about, will be any better. In fact, most Americans should fear it if it is anything like this one.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on the wall, yesterday the Washington Post reported that the Trump administration is planning to divert $7.2 billion in funding from the Defense Department to fund his border wall with Mexico.

Once again, the administration proposes stealing this funding from military families and counterdrug programs, bringing the total amount that the President has stolen—stolen—from our troops and our families to over $13 billion.

The last time the President took money away from military construction, serious military projects suffered—schools in Kentucky, medical facilities in North Carolina, and hurricane recovery projects in Florida. Now the President wants to take even more money away from these projects for a border wall that he promised Mexico would pay for. This is another slap in the face to our Armed Forces, their families, and all of the places throughout America that have military bases that need new construction funding.

Some Senate Democrats strongly oppose this action. We will continue to oppose the transfer of counterdrug funding for the wall, and we will force yet another vote to terminate the President's bogus national emergency declaration and return these much needed military construction funds back to the military, to the men and women in our Armed Forces, and to their families. Our Republican friends, hopefully, will join us in that vote.

President Trump is once again subverting the will of Congress—once again thumbing his nose at the Constitution. The Founders gave Congress the power of the purse, not the President, and this Chamber has refused repeatedly to fund the President's wall. But whether it is to Federal appropriations, foreign policy, or our oversight authority, President Trump seems to have little regard for constraints placed on the Executive. He seems to view the Constitution as merely a nuisance, some inconvenient obstacle in the way of his personal and political interests. It is time for Democrats and Republicans to say: Enough.

I would say one final thing to my conservative friends. The true foundation of conservatism is to minimize the powers of government, particularly the Executive, because they believe it provides more room for the individual. Where are our conservative voices when Donald Trump, in issue after issue—one of the most egregious being this border wall—takes the power away from Congress, away from the American people, and arrogates it onto his own personal wishes?

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, it appears that we are likely to be considering some version of the USMCA, implementing legislation this week, so I want to address this agreement, but in order to do that, I think we have to start with the underlying NAFTA agreement, which has been in place for some years, and ask a question, which is, Why did we go down the path of renegotiating NAFTA in the first place? Let's start there.

As I can imagine, one reason that one might want to renegotiate a trade agreement is if the trade agreement in question were not a reciprocal agreement. If it treated one party differently than it treated the other parties, then you might question whether that is a fair arrangement and might decide that if it is not, it needs to be revisited. That certainly would not describe NAFTA. NAFTA is entirely reciprocal.

Another reason one might decide to renegotiate a trade agreement is if there were tariffs—meaning it wasn't really a free-trade agreement; it was an agreement that maybe changed the terms of trade. But if you still had tariffs, you might decide, as a free-trader like me, that it would be a good idea to renegotiate so that we can eliminate the remaining tariffs.

Well, that certainly isn't the motivation, either, because with NAFTA, there are zero tariffs on 100 percent of manufactured goods that cross the borders of any of the three countries that are parties and zero tariffs on 97.5 percent of agricultural goods. So really there is not much more to do on the tariff side.

By the way, that is true about any other kinds of restrictions on trade. There are no quotas, no obstacles. This is a free-trade agreement. That is what it is. It is fair, it is free, and it is reciprocal among the three countries. As a matter of fact, since NAFTA was adopted, U.S. exports to Mexico, for instance, have increased 500 percent. That is true of Pennsylvania exports to Mexico, as it is on average for all 50 States.

I will state that modernizing the agreement always made sense, right? We now have this huge digital economy that did not exist back in the early nineties when NAFTA was adopted, so it definitely makes sense—it always makes sense to modernize, to update. But I think it is very clear that modernizing and updating were not the driving motivations for renegotiating NAFTA and adopting USMCA. The fundamental reason was that we have a trade deficit with Mexico. It is pretty persistent every year. It is not a huge deficit, but we have a trade deficit with Mexico, and that was deemed to be unacceptable to the administration.

So the fundamental purpose of renegotiating NAFTA and the reason Mexico and Canada had to be coerced into this new agreement was so that we could diminish exports from Mexico. Despite the fact that economists universally understand that a trade deficit with a country like Mexico is a meaningless measure, nevertheless, that is the goal.

Since trade in cars and car parts is the source of the trade deficit with Mexico, it is the auto sector that bears the brunt of the restrictions.

Let me suggest that one useful way to think about USMCA is that it is NAFTA with two categories of changes. The first category is the modest constructive modernizations I alluded to. They are mostly taken from the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement that had been negotiated by a previous administration. Examples include requiring that there be free digital trade. So you can't impose a tax on a data transfer, for instance, or you can't impose a tariff on software, and you can't require that data be stored locally. These are good things.

It is important to note they are codifying existing practices. Canada, Mexico, and the United States do not currently impose obstacles and tariffs on this kind of economic activity. Under USMCA, they won't be able to; it will be codified. So we will make permanent that which is already the practice. There is a very, very tiny reduction in Canadian protectionism with respect to dairy products.

For the most part, these modernizing features are modest, they come from TPP, but most importantly, they could have been achieved without the second category of changes I am about to describe. They could have been achieved because they weren't really controversial.

The other important category of changes to NAFTA that USMCA contains is a full series of protectionist measures that are designed to diminish trade and/or investment. So for the first time in certainly modern times, we are going to consider a trade agreement that is designed to diminish trade, which should be very disturbing for those of us who understand how

much economic growth comes from trade.

What are some of the specifics? Well, the specific changes that are meant to diminish trade—as I said, the auto sector bears the brunt of it. It really is the end of free trade in automobiles and auto parts with respect to Mexico. The agreement imposes minimum wage requirements that are designed to be impossible for Mexican factories to meet, and when they don't meet them, Mexican autos and auto parts will be subject to a tax. So Americans who buy these cars will have to pay a tax on them. This is designed to make Mexico and Mexican factories less productive.

We have folks who think that is somehow a good thing for the United States. It is not. This minimum wage requirement and the tariffs that will follow from it will simply make the entire North American auto industry less competitive because we have integrated supply chains, and American domestic manufacturers use parts that originate in Mexico. Those parts will now be more expensive. It will mean higher prices for American consumers, who will have to pay more money for a car and therefore will have less money available for any of the other things they would like to consume. It will probably lead to an increase or acceleration in the shift to automation because when you artificially establish an arbitrary wage rate that is unaffordable, it creates an incentive to avoid labor costs entirely with automation. All of that means fewer jobs.

We are already seeing a reduction. We have a terrific economy generally, but the manufacturing sector is actually not participating in this tremendous expansion. We have been losing jobs in manufacturing as a result of tariffs we have been imposing.

With the full anticipation of this agreement coming, the auto sector in the United States of America has been shedding jobs. We have been losing jobs as employers in this sector see where we are heading on this policy. That is one item.

Another way we are restricting trade is by arbitrarily putting an expiration date on this trade agreement. It expires 16 years from the date of enactment. There is a mechanism by which, if all three parties unanimously and simultaneously agree, they can extend it, but the default setting is for this thing to go away, for this to expire.

We have never put a termination date on a trade agreement. On all of the trade agreements we have done—and there are dozens—we have never had an expiration, and there is a good reason. The reason is, as you get anywhere close toward that expiration date, an uncertainty emerges about what the trade regime would be like if the agreement is not extended. That has a chilling effect on trade and investment, so it is a very bad idea.

Our Trade Rep has argued that, well, these trade agreements ought to be renegotiated periodically anyway. First of all, not necessarily—a free and fair and reciprocal trade agreement that has no barriers to trade doesn't necessarily need to be renegotiated with any specific frequency, and secondly, it can be renegotiated without an expiration. The question is, What is the default setting? Do we assume the arrangement continues, or do we assume the arrangement ends? Unfortunately, in USMCA, it all comes to an end.

There is another provision that is very disturbing, and that is the almost complete destruction of what is known as the investor-state dispute mechanism. This is the mechanism by which American investors in Canada and Mexico, in this case, can adjudicate a dispute because sometimes the local court in those countries does not treat the foreign investor—the American investor—in that country fairly. That happens sometimes.

So 50 or more of our bilateral investment treaties and trade agreements have this mechanism, the investor-state dispute settlement mechanism, so that if an American investor or an American employer with an investment overseas in one of these countries is being treated unfairly, they have a place to go to get a fair adjudication of their dispute.

In March of 2018, 22 currently serving Republican Senators sent a letter to the Trade Representative. It says: ''ISDS provisions at least as strong as those contained in the existing NAFTA must be included in the modernized agreement to win congressional support.''

There is actually a broad consensus about its importance, which is why it is in every other trade agreement we have ever had. But USMCA completely guts these investor protections. It limits it very narrowly to just several sectors in Mexico and eliminates it entirely in Canada. The irony of this is, in the 30 years that we have had these investor-state dispute settlement provisions, every time the United States was a litigant, the United States won.

This has been a jurisdiction that has been very, very helpful to the United States, and we have given it away. It is out the door. That is because there are some, I think, advocates for eliminating this who think, in a classic protectionist mindset, that an investment in another country necessarily comes at an expense to investment in America. That is completely wrong. Most investment overseas is meant to serve overseas markets, and it results in jobs in the United States in management and supervision and accounting and planning and all kinds of aspects of overseeing that investment overseas. But now we are going to have a chill imposed on this activity.

Well, those provisions I just described were the deal as it was reached back in May, and at that point, our Democratic colleagues said that the agreement was not acceptable. So our Trade Rep and a number of House Members, in particular, entered into a whole new series of negotiations, and from there, the agreement got worse.

What happened there—let me talk about just a couple of categories. One is a whole set of labor provisions. Basically, the United States forced Mexico to pass labor laws designed to facilitate the unionization of their factories. It is none of our business what the labor laws are in Mexico, but we forced them to pass these laws.

Then it gets worse. The USMCA creates this elaborate mechanism by which American taxpayers are forced to pay to enforce Mexican labor laws. Richard Trumka, from the AFL–CIO, said: ''For the first time there truly will be enforceable labor standards—including a process that allows for the inspections of factories and facilities that are not living up to their obligations.''

So he is alluding to the mechanism that is established in USMCA to allow site inspections. I remind my colleagues that this agreement is fully reciprocal. I wonder how much American businesses are going to appreciate having Mexican inspectors come in to inspect their facilities to see if they are in compliance with American labor law. This is there because it is perceived to be in organized labor's economic interests.

First, it increases the expense and diminishes the productivity of Mexican plants, which some people think is a good thing. I think it is a bad thing for American consumers to have to pay more than necessary. But in any case, American taxpayers are going to pay hundreds of millions of dollars over years to enforce another country's labor laws.

Another provision that was insisted on in the latter parts of the negotiation is the removal of intellectual property protection for biologics. As you know, biologics are complex new medicines derived from living cells. It is one of the most exciting things in medicine because it has allowed scientists to use living organisms—or these cells from living organisms—to produce wonderful, wonderful curative medicines. It is very exciting.

Under U.S. law, when a business develops such a new medicine, which comes at enormous cost to get it to market, we provide 12 years' worth of what we call data exclusivity. It is the exclusive ability to market that medicine so that the company can recoup the billions of dollars that are spent developing it.

Well, 12 years is the period of protection we provide for that intellectual property. When the Trans-Pacific Partnership was being negotiated, the Obama administration insisted on at least 8 years. We are the only country that is, by far, the leading country in developing this new category of medicine. We are the ones who have the incentive to protect this intellectual property. Other countries—such as Mexico, Canada, and other countries around the world—don't really care

about protecting it because it is not theirs. They argue for less intellectual property protection; we argue for more. That is the general nature of the context.

As I said, under the Trans-Pacific Partnership, everybody had agreed on 8 years. Not in USMCA. In USMCA, we agreed to zero—zero—no period of data exclusivity to protect the intellectual property of this very exciting, new kind of medicine. This is so ironic because right now—as an aside—we are in this ongoing, protracted, tough battle with China over a number of their economic practices. Chief among them is their theft of intellectual property. We are rightly insisting that we are going to defend and protect our intellectual property because it is the crown jewel of the American economy. The most precious thing we have is the creativity of the American people. So we are insisting that we have robust protection for intellectual property. Here, in USMCA, we give it away. We just give it away.

There is another aspect of this that is important to consider, and that is that there is not going to be any boost to economic growth as a result of swapping out NAFTA for USMCA. The U.S. International Trade Commission, which is an independent agency, part of the U.S. Federal Government, did a big, extensive study, and they did a report.

Their report said that USMCA will create a net of 176,000 jobs. Well, if that were true, it would be trivial in the context of our economy. Our economy has been creating more than that number of jobs every month for years now. It is a tiny number for 72 months when we have been producing more jobs than that each and every month—not over 72 months. But worse than being a very small number, it is just not true. The study says that, on balance, the trade restrictive provisions, some of which I alluded to, will diminish trade and cause U.S. growth to decline, and any offsetting growth just comes from reducing the uncertainty about whether the free trade and digital trade that I alluded to continues.

However, the ITC cost-benefit analysis explicitly chose not to attempt to quantify the sunset clause. There is no question that is a negative. They didn't even attempt to quantify it. They did their analysis before these new labor provisions and before the abandonment of protection for intellectual property of biologics—before that even emerged on the scene. We know those have a negative effect on growth. The bottom line is, there is going to be no additional economic growth from this agreement.

But there is a tax increase. The Congressional Budget Office did their analysis, and they concluded—rightly—that there will be tariffs added to the sales of cars. American consumers will be paying a tax increase in the form of this tariff on autos and auto parts. That is definitely part of this agreement.

To conclude on the substantive matters, we took a true free trade agreement, and we added some constructive features. We did some modernizing from the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which was constructive, but then we slapped on an expiration date. We imposed costly new restrictions on one of our trading partners. We eliminated the dispute settlement mechanism for U.S. investors. We dropped the intellectual property protection for the most innovative medicines we have. We saddled American taxpayers with $84 million over 4 years to enforce Mexican labor and environmental laws. For all of this, we get basically no additional economic growth—probably a little bit.

It is worth noting that the Members of this body who have proudly and openly opposed every trade agreement they have ever been asked to cast a vote on—they voted no. On this, they are going to vote yes. For the first time in two decades, the AFL–CIO is supporting a trade deal when they have opposed all free trade agreements. There is a reason. It is because we are going backward on trade. It is because this agreement is designed to limit trade.

A quick word on process here—this is important. The implementing legislation that is going to get to the floor one way or another sometime soon is not compliant with trade promotion authority. What that means is, it should not get the expedited treatment and the protection from all amendments that trade promotion authority confers on a narrow category of legislation that conforms completely—completely—with the trade promotion authority law.

Let's remember a few fundamental things here. Trade policy is the responsibility of Congress. The Constitution assigns it to the U.S. Congress to establish trade policy, including the establishment of tariffs, the management of tariffs, and everything to do with trade.

With TPA, we delegate the responsibility that is ours to the executive branch with a lot of conditions attached, and if they don't comply with those conditions, then this legislation shouldn't be whisked through Congress on a simple majority vote with no amendments, which is meant, under TPA, to be limited only to those pieces of legislation that comply entirely with the trade promotion act legislation.

Here are a couple of specific ways in which this agreement violates the trade promotion authority. First of all, Congress did not receive the final agreement according to the timeframe contemplated by TPA. We are supposed to get the final agreement 30 days before there is a vote in committee or on the floor on the implementing language. The reason that is important is so that Congress can give some feedback to the administration. This is a draft that is meant to be a draft of the implementing legislation submitted to Congress so that Congress can then consider how it might want to make changes since this is, after all, our responsibility. The administration chose not to do that at all. They finalized this agreement in early to mid-December, and there was a vote on the House floor on the final version of the implementing language within a week or so—nothing close to the 30-day period that is meant to enable Congress to influence its own product.

There is another provision in the trade promotion authority legislation that requires that the implementing legislation must contain only provisions ''strictly necessary or appropriate to implement such trade agreement.'' Why is that important? It is because we passed this legislation with a 51-vote threshold—simple majority threshold. Almost everything else in the Senate requires 60 votes. So we are saying that if you want to use the expedited process and if you want to be able to pass this legislation with a simple majority, you have to limit it only to that which is absolutely strictly necessary and appropriate for implementing this trade agreement; otherwise, obviously, people could stick in any old thing they want that they think there is a majority vote for if there are not 60 votes for it. In other words, abusing this narrow construct really dramatically underlines the 60-vote threshold for legislation in the Senate.

Well, let me give you a few examples of cases where it is clearly being abused in this agreement. One is that there are appropriations in the implementing legislation. This is a complete first. In all of our trade agreements in the past, there has been a necessity for some spending. The appropriations bill to spend that money has always been a separate legislative vehicle precisely so that it would be open to scrutiny, subject to amendment, and subject to a 60-vote threshold. Not this time. The hundreds of millions of dollars of spending in this bill include, for instance, $50 million in salaries and expenses for the office of the U.S. Trade Rep. Well, maybe the folks at the U.S. Trade Rep all deserve a big raise; maybe that is true. But that should be done in a separate piece of legislation because it is not necessary and appropriate for the implementation of USMCA. Not only that, but they have taken all of this spending and imposed an emergency designation on it. There is an emergency designation on it. So, apparently, it is an emergency that the folks over at the U.S. Trade Rep's office get a pay raise. Apparently it is an emergency that all this money be spent. That is ridiculous; of course it is not. The reason they put the emergency designation on it is that spending in this body—spending in Congress that gets an emergency designation doesn't have to be offset. So if it exceeds the permissible maximum spending we have all agreed to and if you slap on an emergency designation, then that is

OK. If you don't have the emergency designation, then new spending has to be offset with reduction in spending somewhere else.

The reason we have the emergency designation is that emergencies actually can occur. There are earthquakes; there are fires; there are floods; and those happen. But I am sorry, a pay raise for staffers at the U.S. Trade Rep does not qualify.

So, for a variety of reasons, this legislation we are going to be considering is not compliant with trade promotion authority. That doesn't mean it can't move. It simply means it needs to move under the regular order. It should be an ordinary bill on the floor as any ordinary legislation, and, sadly, from my point of view, I am pretty sure the votes are there to pass it. There are probably going to be the votes to pass what I think is a badly flawed agreement—an agreement that restricts trade rather than expanding trade. I certainly hope we will do it under the regular order because it does abuse trade promotion authority.

The last point I would make is that I certainly hope this does not become a template for future trade agreements. We have an opportunity to do wonders for our constituents, our consumers, and our workers by reaching new and additional trade agreements with the UK, Japan, Vietnam, and all kinds of countries that have tremendous growth potential, and our economy will grow if we can work out mutual free trade agreements with these countries. I am very much in favor of that. I wouldn't want these protectionist, restrictionist policies that found their way into this agreement to be part of future agreements.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, about 4 weeks after the House voted on the Articles of Impeachment, the House will name impeachment managers, and we will see those Impeachment Articles delivered here to the Senate, but for the impeachment managers' role in the Senate, that will conclude the House's participation in the impeachment process, and ours—the Senate's responsibilities—will begin.

As I said, this vote occurs 4 weeks after the House concluded its whirlwind impeachment investigation. As I look more and more closely at this, it strikes me as a potential case of impeachment malpractice, and I will explain.

Four weeks after they passed these two Articles of Impeachment, 4 weeks after they concluded the President has acted in a way to invoke our most extreme constitutional sanction that he should be removed from office, they finally will send these Impeachment Articles to us.

As I look at the Impeachment Articles, I am astonished that even though we heard discussions of quid pro quo, bribery, and other crimes, the House of Representatives chose not to charge President Trump with a crime. How you then go on to prove a violation of the constitutional standard of high crimes and misdemeanors when you don't even charge the President with a crime, I am looking forward to having the impeachment managers and the President's lawyers address that. At least at first blush, it does not appear to meet the constitutional standard of bribery, treason, high crimes, and misdemeanors.

President Clinton was charged with a crime—the crime of perjury—but, here, President Trump has not been accused of a crime. The vague allegation is that he abused his office. That can mean anything to anybody. Just think, if we dumb down the standard for impeachment below the constitutional standard, what that does is it opens up the next President, who may have a House majority composed of the other party, vulnerable to charges of impeachment based on the allegation that he abused his office, even if they did not commit a high crime or misdemeanor. So impeachment becomes a political weapon, which is what this appears to be, rather than a constitutional obligation for the House and the Senate.

Last month, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, JERRY NADLER, said on national television it was a ''rock-solid case'' against the President—''rock-solid,'' but in the moments after the House voted to impeach the President, there seemed to be a lot of doubt about whether there was sufficient evidence to convict the President of high crimes and misdemeanors; so much doubt, in fact, that it led the Speaker of the House to withhold the articles until the Senate promised to fill in the gaps left by the House's inadequate record.

She sought promises from Senator MCCONNELL, the majority leader, that the Senate would continue the House's investigation—continue the House's investigation—the one which only a few weeks prior one of her top Members said was a rock-solid case. Well, it either is or isn't.

I would say that the Speaker's actions and her cold feet and her reluctance to send the Impeachment Articles here for the last month indicate to me that she is less than confident that the House has done their job.

As a matter of fact, in the second Article of Impeachment, they charged the President with obstruction of Congress. Here is the factual underpinning of that allegation: Chairman SCHIFF would issue a subpoena to somebody who works at the White House. They would say: Well, I have to go to court to get the judge to direct me because I have conflicting obligations—a subpoena from Congress and perhaps a claim of some privilege based on confidential communications with the President. Rather than pursue that in court, which is what happened in the Clinton impeachment and what should happen in any dispute over executive privilege, Chairman ADAM SCHIFF of the House Intelligence Committee dropped them like a hot potato, and they simply moved on in their rush to impeach without that testimony and without that evidence. So now they want the Senate to make up for their failure here by calling additional witnesses.

I sometimes joke that I am a recovering lawyer and a recovering judge. I spent 20 years or more of my life either in courtrooms trying cases or presiding over those cases or reviewing the cases that had been tried based on an appellate record in the Texas Supreme Court.

Our system of justice is based on an adversary system. You have the prosecutor who charges a crime—that is basically what the Articles of Impeachment are analogous to—and then you have a jury and a judge who try the case presented by the prosecution. We have a strange, even bizarre, suggestion by the Democratic leader in the Senate that somehow the jury ought to call additional witnesses before we even listen to the arguments of the President, his lawyers, and the impeachment managers who spent 12 weeks getting 100 hours or more worth of testimony from 17 different witnesses.

So this discussion about whether there will be witnesses or no witnesses is kind of maddening to me. Of course, there will be witnesses—witnesses whom the impeachment managers choose to present, maybe through their sworn testimony and not live in the well of the Senate, but it is no different in terms of its legal effect, or witnesses and evidence, documentary evidence, that the President's lawyers choose to present.

I think the majority leader has wisely proposed—and now it looks like 53 Senators have agreed—that we defer this whole issue of additional witnesses until after both sides have had the chance to present their case and Senators have a chance to ask questions in writing.

This is going to be a very difficult process for people who make their living talking all the time, which is what Senators do. Sitting here and being forced to listen and let other people do the talking is going to be a challenge, but we will have a chance to ask questions in writing, and the Chief Justice will direct those questions to the appropriate party—either the impeachment managers or the President's lawyers—and they will attempt to answer those questions.

As I look at this record more, I am beginning to wonder whether the basic

facts are really disputed. So when people talk about calling additional witnesses, I think what they are more interested in is a show trial and getting cameras and media coverage rather than actually resolving any disputed facts and applying the legal standard—which is what the Constitution provides—in order to decide whether the President should be acquitted or convicted. That should be the role of the Senate sitting as a jury.

The House, it seems, was under no deadline—other than an internally imposed deadline—to complete their impeachment investigation. They could have subpoenaed more witnesses. They could have waited for those subpoenas to play their way out in court and held a vote once they truly believed they had sufficient evidence to impeach the President, enough evidence that they felt confident presenting at a Senate trial.

If a prosecutor were to do in a court of law what the House impeachment inquiry did, they would be justly accused of malpractice. To drop the witnesses rather than to actually go to court to try to get the testimony you need in order to support the Articles of Impeachment, that is malpractice because you know if this were a court of law, in all likelihood, the judge would summarily dismiss the case, saying: You haven't shown the evidence to support the charges that the grand jury—in this case, the House—has made under the Articles of Impeachment.

We know that rather than develop the record that would be sufficient to prove their case, Members of the House gave themselves an arbitrary deadline for their investigation and made speed their top priority. Now finding themselves with the short end of the stick, they are trying to pin their regrets and their malpractice on Members of the Senate.

Our Democratic colleagues are trying to paint the picture in a way that makes it look like Senate Republicans are failing in their duties, but we will fulfill our constitutional role and duties. The only question is, did the House perform their constitutional duties in an adequate way to meet the constitutional standard?

Speaker PELOSI went so far as to say that failing to allow additional witnesses would result in a ''coverup.'' I think I have heard that same charge by the Democratic leader here. I don't really understand the logic of that one. It seems like the only coverup happening is when the Speaker is covering up her caucus's shoddy and insufficient investigation.

She is trying to distract from the fact that there is very little, if any, evidence to support the Articles of Impeachment. She is trying to place the blame on the Senate—a strategy you don't have to have x-ray vision to see through.

The Speaker went so far as to say last Sunday that Senators will ''pay a price'' for not calling witnesses, but I think they are now beginning to take the mask off and expose their true motivation. Based on what we know now, this is no longer about 67 votes to convict and remove President Trump; this is about forcing Senators who are running for election in 2020 to take tough political votes that can be then exploited in TV ads. That seems to me to demean this whole impeachment affair. This is a thermonuclear weapon in a constitutional sense. To accuse someone of high crimes and misdemeanors and to seek to convict them in a court and remove them from office is a very serious matter, but it has been treated and is being treated like a trivial political matter, a political football.

Based on the way that Speaker PELOSI and others have characterized the need for additional witnesses, you would think no one had testified before or had been deposed. But that would be to ignore the House Intelligence Committee's 298-page report—a 298-page report—detailing their impeachment inquiry. It details the actions of the committee, including dozens of subpoenas and the taking of more than 100 hours of testimony from 17 witnesses. So when somebody says this is a question of witnesses or no witnesses, I say that is not true. Those are not the facts. We already have 100 hours of testimony that could be presented in the Senate if it is actually relevant to the Articles of Impeachment, to what is charged.

To be clear, all the information will be available to the Senate, and the testimony of 17 of those witnesses will likely be presented by the impeachment managers.

Again, our Democratic friends in the House apparently are having a little bit of buyer's remorse, cold feet. Pick your metaphor. With 4 weeks of deep contemplation separating them from the impeachment vote they took, they no longer believe, apparently, that they have enough evidence to prove a high crime and misdemeanor, which is the constitutional standard. As for that 298-page report that they were once so proud of, apparently now they concede by their actions that it falls short of that rock-solid case they promised. So rather than taking responsibility for their own impeachment malpractice, rather than admitting that they rushed through the investigation, skipped over witnesses whom they now deem critical to the inquiry, they try now to blame the Senate and put the burden of proof on our shoulders. Well, as I said earlier, there is no question whether witnesses will be presented. Some of them will be presented who testified in the House of Representatives—the 17 witnesses who testified over 100 hours.

I think the Senate, based on the vote of 53 Senators, has wisely deferred whether additional witnesses will be subpoenaed until after we have had a chance to hear from the parties to the impeachment and an opportunity by Senators to actually ask clarification questions.

Leader MCCONNELL has been consistent in saying that we wouldn't be naming witnesses before the start of the trial, in line with the precedent set by the Clinton impeachment trial. Ironically, the Democratic leader was in a position during the Clinton impeachment trial that no additional witnesses should be offered and now finds himself, ironically enough, in the opposite posture based on nothing more than the difference in the identity of the President being impeached.

To reiterate, we will have a chance to hear the arguments from both sides, along with any documents they choose to present. We will move to the Senators' questions, and then we will decide whether more evidence is required. I personally am disinclined to have the jury conduct the trial by demanding additional evidence. I think that is the role of the impeachment managers and of the President's lawyers. I know fair-minded people can differ, and if 51 Senators want additional witnesses under this resolution, they will have an opportunity to have them subpoenaed.

This is going to be a fair process, unlike the House process, which has been—well, I was going to say ''a three-ring circus,'' but that is not fair to the circus. We are going to have a dignified, sober, and deliberate process here, befitting the gravity of what we have been asked to decide. No one, neither the prosecution nor the defense, will be precluded from participating. As a matter of fact, they will drive the process. That is the way trials are conducted in every courthouse in America, and that is the process we should adopt here.

In stark contrast to the partisan chaos that consumed the impeachment inquiry in the House, we are going to restore order, civility, and fairness. Over the last 4 weeks, there has been a whole lot of talk but not much action from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle in the House. They have taken what should be a serious and solemn responsibility in Congress and turned it into a partisan playground less than a year before the next election, when tens of millions of Americans will be voting on their choice for President of the United States.

By needlessly withholding the Articles of Impeachment for 4 weeks, the Speaker has all but ensured that the Senate's impeachment trial will overlap with the Iowa caucuses. That is where our Democratic friends will choose their Presidential primary winner, starting with the Iowa caucuses.

This trial could even stretch into the New Hampshire primary or the Nevada caucuses. I find it curious that the Speaker's decision will force four Senators who are actually running for President in those primary contests to leave the campaign trail in these battleground States and come back to Washington, DC, and be glued to their seats, sitting as jurors during this trial, when I am sure they would rather be out on the hustings. Rather than

shaking hands with voters, they will be sitting here like the rest of us. That will be a big blow to their election. Based on what we have seen in the press, these four Senators aren't what I would call ''happy campers,'' and I don't blame them.

You had better believe, though, that their competitors are celebrating. They are going to have the Iowa caucuses, perhaps, and maybe New Hampshire and Nevada all to themselves while these four Senators who are running for President in the Democratic primary will have to be here like the rest of us.

So, in holding the articles for 4 weeks, the Speaker just cleared out some of the top contenders in the Presidential primaries—the early ones—and it is pretty clear that the candidate who stands the most to gain from their absence is former Vice President Biden.

The politics of this impeachment circus show that it was never a serious one. A constitutional issue? Wrong. It was a political exercise from the start, meant to hurt this President and help the Speaker's party elect a Democrat in his stead in November—or at least NANCY PELOSI's friends in the Democratic Party.

Over these last 4 weeks, we have been standing by, waiting to do our duty, wasting valuable time, while the Democrats in the House try to come to terms with their embarrassing and inadequate investigation, and watching them as they try to figure out how they could possibly get themselves out of this embarrassing box canyon they have walked into.

I know we are all eager for the process to finally shift from the House's hands to the Senate, and I am hopeful that later this evening we will finally be free from Speaker PELOSI's manipulative games when it comes to impeachment.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, finally there is some good news here in Washington that we will actually get some important things done, and, particularly, I am talking about the USMCA, or the United States-Mexico-Canada Trade Agreement. I am hopeful that we can get that voted out of the Senate by tomorrow and get it onto the President's desk. This is a top priority for my constituents, who are farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers, as well as consumers, whose daily lives are impacted by trade with our neighbors to the north and south. We will soon be able to mark it as yet another win for Texas under this administration.

For more than a quarter of a century, NAFTA, or the North American Free Trade Agreement, the predecessor to the USMCA, has been the guiding force in our trading relationships with Mexico and Canada. By virtually any measure, it has been a great success. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce estimates that 13 million American jobs have been created and are dependent on trade with Mexico and Canada. That is a big deal.

A lot has changed over the last 25 years. In fact, then, the internet was in its infancy, smartphones didn't exist, and the only shopping you did was at a brick-and-mortar store. The way business is conducted today has evolved significantly. It is time we bring our trade agreements up to date.

That is where the USMCA comes in. It preserves the basic hallmark provisions of NAFTA, like duty-free access to Mexican and Canadian markets, and it adds measures to modernize the agreement. Additionally, the USMCA includes strong protections for intellectual property, which is critical to protecting the incredible innovation that Americans create right here at home. It also cuts the redtape that has been preventing countless small businesses from tapping into foreign markets.

It also accounts for e-commerce and digital products at a time when governments around the world are proposing all kinds of new taxes on e-commerce. It is actually the first free-trade agreement with a digital trade chapter. That is why a lot of folks call the USMCA ''NAFTA–2.0.'' It is better, it is stronger, and it is up to date.

I have no doubt that this agreement will be a boon to both our national and Texas economies, but I do have some concerns about the path it has taken to ratification. This product was essentially negotiated with the House and given to the Senate as a fait accompli, and I worry that that can set a dangerous precedent for future trade agreements. I hope that is not something we will allow to become a habit, but it doesn't diminish the fact that this trade agreement will bring serious benefits to my constituents and my State and continue to strengthen our national economy.

I appreciate the President's commitment to strengthening our trading agreements with our neighbors and bolstering a stronger North America. The USMCA is a big win for all three countries involved, and it is a big win for the State of Texas.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

IRAN

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, last week we were very close to an act of war between the United States and Iran. I must tell you, we have been talking about this potential threat for a long time. I am a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We have held numerous meetings in our discussion about the fact that there is no authorization for the use of military force by the United States against Iran that has been approved by Congress. I remember, during hearings, listening to administrative witnesses who said: Well, there is no intent to use force against Iran.

Well, Congress did not act. Even though, I must tell you, several of our colleagues, including this Senator, had urged us to take up an authorization for the use of military force in regards to the problems in the Middle East, there was no action taken. I want to applaud Senator KAINE, who has been working on this for several years, and our former colleague Senator Flake, who did everything they could to bring a bipartisan discussion and action in regards to exercising congressional responsibility on the use of force by our military.

Well, we now know that this is a real threat, that we may be going to war without Congress's involvement, which is contrary not only to our Constitution but to the laws passed by the U.S. Congress. So I want to thank Senator KAINE and Senator LEE for filing S.J. Res. 68, a bipartisan resolution. I hope it will receive the expedited process that is envisioned in the War Powers Resolution, and I hope that we will have a chance to act on this in the next few days. It is our responsibility—Congress's responsibility—to commit our troops to combat, and it rests squarely with the legislative branch of government.

Let me first cite the Constitution of the United States. You hear a lot of discussion about the Constitution here on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution says that Congress has the power to declare war.

Now, that was challenged in the 1970s, after Congress had passed the Gulf of Tonkin resolution in regards to our presence in Vietnam.

It was passed in an innocent way to protect American troops and ships that were in that region, but as we know, that resolution was used as justification by President Johnson and others to expand our involvement in Vietnam and, ultimately, led to a very active and costly war for the United States—and lengthy war, I might add.

In 1973, Congress passed the War Powers Act. It wasn't easy. President Nixon vetoed it. We overrode the veto in a bipartisan vote in the U.S. Congress. We did that because of the abuse of power during the Vietnam war.

Let me read what the War Powers Act provides because it is very telling in regard to what we saw last week in regard to Iran, a little over a week ago now. It requires consultation with Congress by the President ''in every possible instance before committing troops to war.'' No. 1, it requires the President to consult with us before he commits any of our troops to an engagement. No. 2, the President is required to report within 48 hours ''into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances.'' So it provides for the imminent involvement or threat to the United States.

No. 3, the President is ''required to end foreign military action after 60 days unless Congress provides a declaration of war or an authorization for the operation to continue.''

We now know that to be an AUMF, an authorization for the use of military force.

Let's fast forward from the passage of that bill in 1973 to rein in the abuse of power by the Executive during the Vietnam war. Let's fast forward to what happened in early January, on January 2, when President Trump ordered the action against Soleimani in Baghdad and took out his life.

Let me start off by saying, none of us has any sorrow over the loss of General Soleimani. He was a bad guy. He was responsible for the deaths of hundreds of people. He was very much a person who should have been held accountable for his activities, but there is a reason for our constitutional protections of checks and balances as it relates to the use of military force by the United States.

The Commander in Chief has certain powers. Congress has certain powers. The Framers of our Constitution intentionally provided for there to be a robust discussion and debate between the legislature and the Executive on war and peace; that we should have that open discussion; and that, in many cases, diplomacy needs to be pursued much more aggressively before we use our military might; that our national security interest in keeping America safe rests with these checks and balances. Again, to bring it to current times in regard to the circumstances with Iran, every witness I have listened to, every expert I have talked to with regard to the Middle East, says it is in the U.S. national security interest to find a diplomatic way to handle our issues in regard to Iran; that a military option would be very costly, a long time, and, most likely, counterproductive with the United States having to keep its troops in that region for a very long time.

Diplomacy is clearly the preferred path. These constitutional provisions provide us with an opportunity to be able to make sure we do what is in the best interest of American national security.

Trump ordered this attack, and the Senate now needs to act, as we saw in the 1970s when Congress did act. Let me start with the War Powers Act and how President Trump had violated the War Powers Act in all three of the provisions I mentioned earlier.

First, was there an imminent involvement or threat? We have all now heard the explanations given by this administration. It was short on detail. It was basically the general concerns. What is most disturbing, we now read press accounts that the President had been planning for months—or the generals had been planning and going over with the President for months whether they should take out General Soleimani.

If they had been planning for months, why didn't they consult with Congress, as required under the War Powers Act? Violation No. 1 to the War Powers Act: Congress was not consulted by President Trump.

No. 2, there are two violations so far; the fact that there wasn't an imminent threat and the fact that there was no consultation with Congress—two violations of the War Powers Act. Then, if he continues to use force beyond the 60 days, he has to come to Congress and get authorization or he has to remove the troops.

Does anyone here believe the President will not hesitate again to use force against Iran? Yet there are no intentions to submit a resolution.

We find the President has violated the War Powers Act in three ways: first, by having no evidence of imminent threat; second, by not consulting with Congress before the attack; and third, by not submitting to us an authorization for the use of military force.

There are some who say the President already has that authority under the authorizations for the use of military force that were passed by Congress after the attack on our country on September 11, 2001.

We are getting to 18 years beyond when that attack took place and those authorizations passed, but let me go through them. The one that is cited the most by the President is the 2002, which is to ''defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq.''

First, let me say, I voted against that resolution, and I believe that was the correct vote, but I think almost everybody in this body would say that authorization is no longer relevant. Since that resolution was passed, the United States has worked with Iraq and has worked with the Government of Iraq. This is a country we try to do business with, so they no longer present the threat that was supposedly present when this resolution was passed. Even to get beyond that, what does Iran have to do with Iraq? I understand they may start with the first letter ''I,'' but there is no relationship here. Under any stretch of the imagination, there is no way you can use the 2002 resolution.

Let's go to the 2001 resolution that was passed on the authorization for use of military force. That was immediately after the attack on September 11: '' . . . to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons.''

There is absolutely zero connection between that language and General Soleimani or Iran as it relates to 9/11, and I think no one could make that connection.

I understand that 2001 has been misused by many administrations. There is no question, I would concur in that conclusion, but in all of those cases, they tried to connect dots. There is no connection of dots here whatsoever.

As we saw in the late 1960s and 1970s in Vietnam, when we had the Gulf of Tonkin resolution that was passed to defend our assets in the Vietnam area—in the Gulf of Tonkin—how it was used by administrations to commit us to a long, engaged military operations. Here, one cannot argue that there is even a semblance of authorization that has been passed by Congress as it relates to Iran.

We also know the President is violating the War Powers Act, and he is likely to use force again in violation of our Constitution and the War Powers Act.

It was my generation that paid a very heavy price because of the Vietnam war. I lost a lot of my high school classmates in the Vietnam war. Let us not exceed our responsibility under the Constitution or allow the President to exceed his. We need to act. The Senate needs to act. We don't need another endless war.

The resolution before us allows us to do what is responsible. I am going to quote from the resolution that Senator KAINE has filed, S.J. Res. 68: '' . . . the President to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces for hostilities against . . . Iran or any part of its government or military, unless explicitly authorized by a declaration of war or specific authorization for use of military force against Iran.''

By the way, the resolution also provides that we always have the right to defend ourselves from an imminent threat, provided that it is an imminent threat, and that we comply with the War Powers Act—I am adding this—that was passed by Congress.

The President has a long track record of exceeding his constitutional authority on matters of foreign policy. We cannot afford to become accustomed or complacent in the face of those excesses. It is our responsibility to carry out our constitutional responsibility.

I urge my colleagues to strongly support S.J. Res. 68 when we have a chance to vote on that, I hope, within the next few days.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, over the last several years, Congress has had significant debates on trade—the

importance of trade, what it means to our markets, what it means to exports, and what it means to States like mine, that being Colorado. The USMCA is incredibly important as we turn to that debate this week.

NAFTA and what it meant to Colorado was incredibly significant and the number of jobs that it created as was the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement and the number of jobs that its agreement created. We have seen the benefits of trade in a State like Colorado for a number of years, and we see the opportunity for additional trade agreements in the future. This past year and this past Congress, we adopted the Asia Reassurance Initiative Act, which created U.S.-Asia trade partnership opportunities in energy—renewable energy and traditional energy.

This week, Congress turns its entire focus to the USMCA and its modernization of the North American Free Trade Agreement. We have to continue looking for new trade opportunities—ways to open up trade around the globe. It is vitally important to agriculture, to our electronic sector, and to our service sector. People of all walks of life and business in Colorado understand the importance of trade and what it means to our industry. If we don't seek out new trade opportunities—it is not like we operate just by ourselves—we know what will happen. We will see China, India, and other countries displace us. We will see them build new supply chains and go around the United States, and we will end up losing those market opportunities, those investment opportunities, and the jobs that go along with them.

If we don't open up new trade opportunities, farmers and ranchers in my home State will suffer. We have already seen incredibly low commodity prices hurt our agricultural communities. One way to overcome that is to open up new markets and create value-added opportunities in those new markets. That is how we can add one more potential tool to our ag economy to help make it survive and thrive. We have new product flows all the time out of our State, and this USMCA agreement is one more way we can create that new flow of opportunity. The North American Free Trade Agreement supports, really, 14 million jobs around the United States. Those are thousands of jobs in all 50 States.

Despite its benefits, however, we can always do a better job of making sure it meets the needs of our modern-day economy by modernizing NAFTA. Modernizing NAFTA to increase market access, to expand energy exports, to maximize domestic energy production, including having provisions on intellectual property and e-commerce, will make this agreement even more beneficial to the United States. If you think back to 1994 and the timeframe of pre-iPhones and pre-iPads and of so much of the technology that we have today, this agreement was in place before that. That is why modernizing this agreement makes sense.

As I mentioned, the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement is incredibly important to the State of Colorado. Out of 750,000 trade-related jobs, there are nearly 220,000 jobs in Colorado—a great pro-trade State—that are directly related to the USMCA. Canada and Mexico are our State's largest trading partners. Obviously, that makes sense, for right in the middle is our State. Amongst Colorado, Canada, and Mexico, we trade more than $2.7 billion worth of goods and support the 220,000 jobs that I just talked about.

Colorado's farmers produce nearly half of all of the potatoes that Mexico imports from the United States. We also supply about 97 percent of all U.S. beverages to Mexico. Mexico has certainly been able to tap the Rockies when it comes to our beverage production in Colorado. Our biggest export—beef—accounts for more than $880 million worth of goods that are shipped to Mexico and Canada.

In 2018, Colorado exported to Mexico more than $45 million worth of milk, cream, cheese, and related dairy products. Meanwhile, we have exported about $2.2 million worth of those products to Canada. The USMCA will reform Canada's protectionist dairy policies and help American dairy farmers access the dairy markets in Canada so that we can increase our exports to Canada in cream, milk, cheese, and other dairy areas. We sent more than $31 million worth of cereals, like wheat, to Mexico in 2018 and more than $2 million worth to Canada.

Even our sugar and candy manufacturers benefit from trade with Mexico and Canada. I just had a meeting with the Western Sugar Cooperative of Colorado. We talked about the importance of trade and about getting this trade agreement right. Both countries have received more than $14 million a piece worth of Colorado's sugar and confectionery exports.

Increased trade with these countries will also benefit the beverage industry in Colorado. As I mentioned, 97 percent of the beverages that Mexico imports are from Colorado, and we shipped more than $63 million worth of beverages to Canada in 2018. Beyond commodities like wheat, dairy, and sugar, Colorado's electronic manufacturers shipped to Canada more than $105 million worth of its goods in 2018, and Mexico received about $60 million worth of our electronic goods.

The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement includes new digital provisions to account for our changing landscape of new technologies, advanced manufacturing products, and it tackles the issue of cross-border dataflow, which is something that was just, basically, in its very infancy when NAFTA was enacted.

We know that the USMCA is a better opportunity for us to gain even more jobs, more income, and more opportunity for the State of Colorado. We know that these trade agreements add to the household incomes across our State and that it benefits our economy. This agreement brings opportunity to all four corners of our State.

New customs and trade rules will cut redtape and make it easier for Colorado's startups and entrepreneurs to sell their products into Canada and Mexico. U.S. agricultural and food exports are expected to rise more than $2 billion every year if the USMCA is adopted. So many goods in Colorado that are in our top 10 exported items are ag related. This $2 billion-a-year increase will mean there will be significant opportunities for Colorado's agriculture.

Obviously, I am very encouraged by the Senate Committee on Finance in its reporting the agreement out favorably last week. I was honored to support the USMCA this morning by voting for the agreement—voting it out of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and out of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which are two of the committees on which I serve. I look forward to its expeditious passage here in the U.S. Senate.

I live in rural Colorado. I am surrounded by wheat farms, corn farms, hog producers, feed lots, and I know how important trade is to our State. This agreement to modernize and continue our agreement with Canada and Mexico is critical to the survival of agriculture in Colorado and this country. I know, with new markets opening around the world, this agreement will continue to be the keystone of Colorado's trade. We stand to benefit tremendously, enormously from this update. Our farmers and ranchers are counting on us to get this done, and our manufacturers are counting on us to get this done. Our economy depends on our getting this done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, at this particular moment in our history, we are witnessing the convergence of three events.

The Senate will likely be sworn in tomorrow for the impeachment trial of President Trump. One of the Articles of Impeachment that will be coming over from the House relates to the President's abuse of power—the charge that he has used the power and prestige of the Office of the Presidency to, among other things, withhold vital U.S. security assistance to Ukraine in order to pressure it to announce an investigation into Burisma, Hunter Biden, and, possibly, Joe Biden in an attempt to get Ukraine to interfere in the upcoming 2020 election on behalf of President Trump.

Now, I am not here today to go into issues directly related to that trial. It is vitally important that we get relevant witnesses, that we get relevant

documents, and that we have a fair trial and get to the truth.

The second event that we learned about just this week that relates to the impeachment trial was that Russian military hackers broke into the Burisma computers in Ukraine and that they used the same phishing techniques that the GRU used—the Russian military intelligence—to break into the Democratic National Committee headquarters' servers during the 2016 Presidential elections. All of the evidence points to another attempt by Vladimir Putin to use his military GRU hackers to interfere in an American election—this time in the 2020 election.

I don't know what is going to happen during the election on November 3 of this year. Obviously, each of us has his hopes as to what the result will be, but that is not the purpose of my being here on the floor today. My focus is on what should unite all of us in this body—that should unite all 100 U.S. Senators—and that is that we should all agree that it is outrageous for any foreign power to interfere in an American election the way Russia interfered in our election in 2016 and that it would be equally outrageous for us, in our knowing that this is Russia's intent in 2020, to sit here and not do anything to protect the integrity of our democracy.

Look, we all know what happened in 2016. Just to refresh our memories, it was the unanimous conclusion of all U.S. intelligence agencies that Russia interfered in the 2016 Presidential election. That was the unanimous conclusion of the leaders of intelligence agencies appointed by President Trump. It was also the bipartisan verdict of the Senate Intelligence Committee, which painstakingly documented the fact that elections systems in all 50 of our States were targeted to one degree or another by Russian hackers in the 2016 elections. In fact, we know this from the outcome of the Mueller investigation that led to the indictment of 12 Russian military intelligence individuals, members of the GRU. They were indicted because of their interference in the 2016 elections.

We also know that Vladimir Putin and the Russians intend to interfere in our elections again in 2020. We know that because of the revelations this week about the actions the GRU is taking with respect to Burisma—same fingerprint, same techniques—but we also know that from our own U.S. intelligence agencies, which, in November of last year, all got together to issue a warning that Russia was going to interfere again in 2020.

I am holding in my hand a joint statement from the leaders of U.S. intelligence and law enforcement agencies, and what they say is that our adversaries—and they point to Russia—will seek to interfere in the voting process or influence voter perceptions. This document is not about the past. This document is not about 2016. This document is about the here and now and the November 2020 elections. And this is, again, from the heads of our intelligence agencies and law enforcement agencies who have been appointed by President Trump.

Now we have overwhelming evidence that Russia interfered in 2016, we have overwhelming evidence and predictions that Russia will interfere again in our elections in 2020, and so we clearly are facing an immediate danger to the integrity of our elections and our democracy. It is like we have a Russian missile in the air right now headed toward our election integrity systems and our electoral process. That is what the intelligence agencies are telling us right now.

We learned the hard way in 2016, and now it is happening all over again. So the question for this body is, When you know something is happening, what are you going to do about it? There are two things we should be doing about it. We should be working to strengthen our elections systems here at home, to harden them, to make it more difficult for Russian military intelligence to hack into them. We should be working with social media companies to prevent the Russian Government and their agents from spending money on advertising on social media or using other techniques on social media to influence American voters. We need to be doing all that. We have appropriated some funds to do that.

We should be doing more than we have, but the best defense is a good offense. We can and should spend money to strengthen and protect our elections systems, but that is not enough because it is kind of like the arms race. We will work to try to better strengthen and protect those systems, and the hackers who are trying to get in will develop new techniques to try to get around them. It is an endless cycle. That doesn't mean we shouldn't harden them—we should—but that is not enough to protect the integrity of our elections.

We have to apply the principle that the best defense is a good offense and make it clear up front to Vladimir Putin and Russia that the costs of interfering in another American election far outweigh the benefits. That is what we need to do because right now it is absolutely cost-free to Vladimir Putin to mess around in our elections. In fact, it is a big benefit to Vladimir Putin and the Russians. That is why they do it.

What do they accomplish? Well, first of all, they succeed in dividing Americans against one another. They succeed in undermining public confidence in the outcome of our elections, and that is part of their overall strategy—to try to undermine democracies, whether here in the United States or in Europe or other places around the world. Maybe they also succeed, ultimately, in weighing in and helping their preferred candidate in an election.

But the point is, right now, if you are Putin, there is zero cost to getting caught interfering in our elections and lots of perceived benefits by Vladimir Putin. So that is why, more than 2 years ago, Senator MARCO RUBIO and I introduced the bipartisan DETER Act, and there are many other Senators, both Democrats and Republicans, who were on that bill. The DETER Act is very straightforward. It would enact into law a very straightforward proposition. It says to Russia—and also to other countries, but the main attack seems to be coming from Russia—it says to Putin and Russia: If we catch you again interfering in our elections, there will be immediate and very harsh penalties for you to pay.

This will happen virtually automatically. So Vladimir Putin will know up front that if our intelligence agencies catch them again, which they are likely to do, then he will finally pay a price for interfering in our elections and trying to undermine our democratic processes. These are not sanctions against a couple of Putin's pals. These are not sanctions against a couple oligarchs. These would be sanctions against major sectors of the Russian economy—state-owned banks, state-owned parts of their energy industry—so their economy will take a big hit if we catch them attacking our democracy once again.

That is absolutely appropriate because what Putin is doing is undermining faith and confidence in our democratic process, and we need to make it clear up front that there is a big price to pay—not because we want those sanctions to go into effect but because we don't. That, of course, is the entire idea behind deterrence. You raise the cost, you raise the price on Putin and Russia to the point it is no longer worth it to interfere in our elections.

That is why Senator RUBIO and I introduced this legislation 2 years ago. We hoped it would be in place before the 2018 midterm elections, but that date has passed, and still here we are in the U.S. Senate having failed to adopt this bipartisan legislation.

I was right here on the floor of the Senate just a few months ago when we were debating the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act. I asked for a vote to include the essential provision of the DETER Act in the Defense authorization bill because it makes a lot of sense that in a bill that is supposed to defend the United States, we include a provision to defend the integrity of our democracy and electoral system against Russian attack or any other attack. Apparently every single Senator in this body agreed because it passed unanimously.

The Senate went on record unanimously saying we should include provisions like the DETER Act in the NDAA to deter Russian interference in our elections. Then we were in negotiations on the NDAA, and it turned out that in the back rooms, behind closed doors, the Trump administration got Republican Senators to insist on throwing that provision out of the NDAA bill.

This was one of the matters that was discussed until the final stages of negotiations on the NDAA, and apparently the majority leader and other Republican Senators, at the behest of the Trump administration, said no—said no to a provision that had been agreed to unanimously by this body to help protect our elections by deterring Russian interference. The question is, Why? Why, when our own intelligence agencies are telling us that Russia is planning to do in 2020 what they did in 2016, would Republican Senate leaders block a provision that lets Putin know ''You will be punished if you do that again. You will be punished if you attack our democracy''? And I haven't gotten a straight answer to that question. Why not? Why not include that provision? Clearly, there are Senators who don't want to build up our defenses and deterrence again Russian interference in our elections.

When we failed to get that into the NDAA, I came to the Senate floor, and I asked for unanimous consent to bring up the bipartisan DETER Act. Because every one of the Senators in this body had voted or said through lack of objection that they wanted the DETER Act in the NDAA, I brought up the bill for unanimous consent passing here. Well, the chairman of the Senate Banking Committee came to the floor and objected, and we had a back-and-forth conversation about the DETER Act.

Yesterday, I was planning to come to this floor and again ask for unanimous consent to take up the DETER Act, but we heard from the chairman of the Banking Committee that he wanted to find a way to get this done. So I am going to take the chairman of the Banking Committee up on that offer, and I hope we can get it done. But I want to be really clear. If we are not able to work this out in a smart, straightforward way, which is what the bill does right now—as I said, it has strong bipartisan support right now—then I will be back on the Senate floor regularly to ask for unanimous consent, and any other Senator who wants to come down here and object can do that. That is their right. But I am going to keep pushing this issue because the clock is ticking. Every day that passes while we know from our own intelligence agencies that Russia plans to interfere in the 2020 election and we don't do anything about it—we are grossly negligent.

I want Senators who are not going to support that to come here in the light of day and let the American public know they are blocking that effort. I hope we don't have to do that. I hope we can work this out. I hope we can pass the bipartisan legislation that has been sitting in the Senate for over 2 years now as we get warning after warning after warning that Vladimir Putin, the GRU, and the Russians intend to interfere in our democratic process again and attack the integrity of our electoral system.

Let's get this done. Let's protect our democracy. Let's make it clear in advance to Putin that the price he will pay for trying to interfere in our democracy will be much higher than any benefit he expects to gain.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAN

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss U.S. policy regarding Iran. We know that in 2009 the new Obama administration came into office at a time when the Iranian regime was racing to develop a nuclear weapon. The prospect of the Iranian regime with a nuclear weapon would present a substantial threat to America and to our allies. At the same time, Iran was engaged in a host of other malign activities, but the most urgent and significant threat was nuclear.

In 2013, Iran was 2 to 3 months from being able to build a nuclear weapon. The Obama administration decided to use hard-nosed diplomacy resulting in the 2015 Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, known by the acronym JCPOA. This agreement was entered into with a number of countries, three of them our allies—the United Kingdom, France and Germany. We also had two partner countries—countries with which we have a lot of tensions and conflict. We were partners with China and Russia. So this agreement stretched from one end of the world to the other.

The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action prevented Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon by, among other steps, authorizing some of the most intrusive inspections that have ever been put into place. This agreement, the JCPOA, did not cover several other nonnuclear malign activities that the Iranian regime was and is engaged in. The JCPOA isolated and largely solved the most dire threat, that of a nuclear-armed Iran in the near future.

This agreement, from its signing in 2015 through 2018, worked. Until recently, Iran was complying with the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. That is the considered judgment of the International Atomic Energy Agency, known as IAEA. The considered judgment of the U.S. intelligence community was that Iran was complying with the agreement. It was also the judgment made by the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. Department of Defense in both the Obama administration and the Trump administration.

The determination that Iran was complying with the agreement is also the assessment of our allies and partners with whom the Obama administration worked to bring into a coalition.

Here is a sampling of assessments prior to recent events. In September 2017, then-Secretary of State Rex Tillerson stated that Iran is in ''technical compliance'' with the JCPOA.

Second, in October 2017, then-Defense Secretary Jim Mattis stated that Iran was ''fundamentally'' in compliance with the JCPOA. ''Overall our intelligence community believes that they have been compliant and the IAEA also says so,'' said General Mattis, then Secretary of Defense.

In March 2018, IAEA Director Amano stated: ''Iran is implementing its nuclear-related commitments. . . . If the JCPOA were to fail, it would be a great loss for nuclear verification and for multilateralism.''

Finally, No. 4, in January 2019, former Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats, a former Republican Senator from the State of Indiana, said: ''We continue to assess that Iran is not currently undertaking the key nuclear weapons development activities we judge necessary to produce a nuclear device.''

Three of the four officials—Secretary of State Tillerson, Secretary of Defense Mattis, and Director of National Intelligence Coats—all three were appointed by President Trump.

President Trump came into office determined to pull out of this agreement, despite the fact that it was working. He surrounded himself with advisers who supported a policy of regime change. Of course, the words ''regime change'' are words that they will not say out loud—the President or his administration—but that is the policy. The American people, after nearly two decades of conflict, know that regime-change policy is a march to war.

This administration calls their regime change policy a ''maximum pressure campaign.'' Its stated goal was to force Iran to negotiate a new agreement that would include a host of other nonnuclear issues. Despite the stated goal, an examination of the methods used to achieve it make it obvious that the administration was engaged in a policy that would most likely lead to war instead of a new agreement. The administration pulled out of the nuclear agreement, which was working, and while it was in effect, it took the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran off the table.

The administration reimposed sanctions which were lifted as part of the nuclear agreement. They engaged in a host of other activities that resulted in increased risks and moved us further away from a diplomatic resolution.

The administration's regime change policy was supposed to deter the Iranian regime from threatening our Nation and its allies. This policy has not done that. This policy was supposed to bring Iran to the bargaining table. It has not. It was supposed to cajole Iran to behave like a ''normal nation.'' Once again, it has not.

Tensions have increased. Threats to our servicemembers, our citizens, and allies have increased, not decreased. The region—the Middle East—is less

stable. Iran is closer—closer—to obtaining a nuclear weapon.

The terrible results of this policy were predictable. The administration, including Secretary Pompeo and former National Security Advisor John Bolton, never had any intention of forging a new diplomatic agreement with Iran. All of this is how our Nation has found itself on the brink of war with Iran, facing the potential of another bloody conflict in the Middle East.

Americans across our country are well aware of the events leading up to the killing of Iranian General Qasem Soleimani, the leader of Iran's Quds Force on January 2. Following the killing of an American contractor at a U.S. military compound in Kirkuk, Iraq, on December 27, the U.S. military retaliated with a strike against the Iranian-backed Kataib Hezbollah terrorist group, killing at least 25 members of the militia and wounding others.

In response, the Iranian Government orchestrated protests in Baghdad, which led hundreds of pro-Iranian protesters to storm the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad on New Year's Eve. The strike against the Quds Force Commander Qasem Soleimani followed.

Soleimani was a military figure who inflicted terror and killed thousands in Israel, Iraq, and Syria as well. You can add other places to that. He killed thousands. He worked to prop up Bashar al-Assad in Syria. He aided Shiite forces that killed hundreds of Americans in Iraq. We have been told that he was behind the attacks on the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad on New Year's Eve. Qasem Soleimani was directly responsible for the killing of hundreds of American soldiers and civilians and wounding many more. He was a despicable person who was the leader of an entity designated as a terrorist organization.

Across the international stage, there are many committed enemies of America who plot every day to do our Nation and our allies harm—every single day. Those entrusted with the national security of our Nation have to assess whether taking direct action against one of those individual enemies increases or decreases risks over time and whether taking actions against those individuals is consistent with our values and our commitment to the rule of law.

This is a high standard, and it should be. We are the United States of America, and we believe that conflicts have rules and limits. We strive for a higher standard that both honors our values and protects our security. Because we have high standards and because we expect our leaders to act prudently and with deliberation, the Constitution requires substantial consultation with Congress regarding matters of war except in limited, urgent circumstances.

Acting with disregard for these standards, President Trump took this unilateral action. The President may have endangered the lives of U.S. servicemembers in the Middle East. He may have also prompted near-lethal retaliation from Iran.

Iran's retaliatory strikes against U.S. bases at Al-Asad and Erbil on January 7 thankfully did not claim any American lives. However, conflicting reports continue to emerge about whether Iran intentionally avoided hitting U.S. personnel, and that raises questions about whether Iran sought to escalate or de-escalate its conflict with the United States.

Video evidence has emerged in recent days showing that the Iranians actually decimated housing units for soldiers on the base. Without having received a classified briefing from the administration about this incident—as opposed to the briefing we had on the killing of Soleimani, which I will get to later—without having that classified briefing, we can rely upon press reports for some information. Press reports indicate that the Iranians were aiming to take American lives.

The fallout from the Soleimani strike didn't end there. On January 8, the Iranian Government covered up the fact that it mistakenly shot down a civilian aircraft killing 176 people onboard. The Iranian people have since taken to the streets in protest of the coverup. I strongly condemn the Iranian Government's crackdown on protesters and support the Iranian people's right to rise up and demand human rights and democratic governance in their country.

But let's not lose focus on a very important matter: President Trump ordered a targeted killing of a high-ranking military official of a country with which we are not in a declared or authorized conflict. This is a serious step which required both a rigorous examination as well as an explanation from the administration. Thus far, the explanations we have received from this administration have been woefully inadequate and inconsistent—and I think that is an understatement.

We have been told that this strike was in response to an ''imminent threat'' that four U.S. Embassies abroad were being targeted, which Defense Secretary Esper almost immediately contradicted.

The word ''imminence'' is important here. Imminence derives from the doctrine of self-defense, which under article 51 of the United Nations Charter and the broader ''laws of war,'' imminence justifies use of force in another state's territory when an armed attack occurs—occurs—or when an armed attack is imminent. Some national security scholars define ''imminence'' as ''leaving no reasonable time for nonforceful measures to obviate such a threat.''

I will speak for myself only, but this is true of a number of Senators, I believe. I have yet to see clear evidence that there was ''no reasonable time'' to seek nonlethal, diplomatic options prior to killing Soleimani. The administration has failed to disclose sufficient detail regarding the imminence of this threat. When asked on Friday, Secretary Pompeo said he did not know when this asserted imminent threat was supposed to take place.

The American people have also heard from Secretary Pompeo and President Trump that the attack was a matter of retribution from events that occurred in the past. We have heard from Secretary Pompeo that this attack was designed to ''restore deterrence,'' but it is unclear that he coordinated with his national security colleagues across the interagency.

We know from reporting from the New York Times that Secretary Pompeo was among the ''most hawkish voices arguing for a response to Iranian aggression.'' The article also goes on to say: ''Top Pentagon officials were stunned'' in reference to the strike.

So the question of why this strike was launched and when it was launched remains unanswered. Both Democratic Senators and Republican Senators asked this question in a classified briefing last week and few received a satisfactory answer. We still lack answers on the ''imminent threat.''

The President has spent the last week at rallies and other appearances triumphantly marking the killing and indicating that the Iranian threat is behind us. The strike authorized by President Trump may have been reckless, taken without appropriate planning for the consequences and aftermath, and done without serious consultation with Congress and—and—within the administration. Contrary to the President's boast, I am gravely concerned we will feel the adverse consequences of this administration's actions across the Iran policy landscape for years to come.

If we think the attacks on the Al-Asad and Kirkuk bases last Tuesday were the end of Iranian retaliation for Soleimani's death, we are likely mistaken, due to the continued threat of the Iranian regime's proxy forces throughout the Middle East. Let's examine the potential negative consequences of the strike. I hope this is something that the administration engaged in before the strike, but it is important to review this.

On January 5, Iran announced that it is no longer bound by the restrictions of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action as it relates to uranium enrichment. This agreement unequivocally extended Iran's breakout time, which is the time it would take to obtain enough highly enriched uranium for a nuclear bomb. The agreement extended the breakout time to 12 months—1 year. Again, before the agreement, Iran's breakout time was 2 to 3 months. So the agreement extended that time, meaning making the world safer by extending that time from 2 to 3 months to 1 year. That is where we were with the implementation of the agreement.

Without this agreement—the JCPOA—without that agreement in

place, Iran could reach the requisite uranium stockpile in as little as 6 months, if not sooner. Iran is closer today to a nuclear weapon than it was a week or so ago, and certainly it is closer to a nuclear weapon since 2018, when the administration withdrew from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. That is one consequence we have to consider. Iran is closer to a nuclear weapon.

No. 2 is ISIS. If the President's October 2019 withdrawal of U.S. forces from Syria and the concurrent abandonment of our Kurdish allies—if that did not create space for the resurgence of ISIS in the Middle East, the President's recent action will almost certainly allow for ISIS to regain a foothold in the region. Just 3 days after the Soleimani strike, the New York Times reported that, and here is the headline, ''U.S.-Led Coalition Halts ISIS Fight as it Steels for Iranian Attacks''—halts ISIS fight. NATO has already suspended its operations against ISIS. We have to consider, how does that outcome make us safer?

Next, No. 3, we have to consider what is happening in Iraq. Iraq voted to expel U.S. troops from their country as a result of the strike. If we fully withdraw from Iraq, where are we going to launch counter-ISIS operations in both Iraq and Syria from? How do we do that—from where? Where was the effort to work with the Iraqi Government in quashing Kataib Hezbollah and countering Iranian influence in Iraq? Now that the Iraqi Government opposes U.S. troop presence in its country, what is the plan? How does the administration plan to restart conversations with Iran to negotiate a ''better'' nuclear deal that will ensure Iran never has a nuclear bomb? How do they restart those negotiations? This strike looks more like another step forward in a policy of regime change rather than a coherent strategy designed to keep our Nation safe by using tough diplomacy and alliance-building to confront Iran.

I have been one of the most determined advocates of being tough on Iran, especially regarding sanctions. Since I came to the Senate in 2007, I have been part of almost every sanctions push in efforts to so-call tighten the screws on the Iranian regime and hold them fully accountable for their actions. All those steps that I have been a part of, and people of both parties have been a part of, were part of a strategy to get the results we saw when the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action was signed.

Now, 2 years and after one particularly dangerous week, President Trump has badly undermined all that progress. The advocates of regime change in Iran are closer than ever to getting the United States into a shooting war with Iran.

The events of the last few weeks remind me of the lead-up to the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003. Across both the House and the Senate, Congress held only seven hearings that dealt directly with the proposed 2002 authorization for the use of military force to authorize the Iraq war. AUMF is the acronym for that. Are seven hearings, over a period of 3 weeks between the House and the Senate, sufficient discussion and debate prior to voting to go to war with Iraq? No. No, that is not sufficient time and not a sufficient number of hearings.

At last count, 201 Pennsylvanians were killed in Iraq and over 1,200 were wounded. Have we learned from the mistakes of 2002 and 2003 that led to those deaths and all those Pennsylvanians being wounded and many thousands beyond that killed and wounded in the Iraq war? Have we learned? Have we learned those lessons yet? We have a duty—an abiding obligation—not to repeat the mistakes of the past and to constrain the actions of a President who may endanger the lives of U.S. servicemembers and Americans abroad.

Before we get too far down this path, Congress must reassert its constitutional duty to debate and authorize war. Prior to authorizing a strike, we must assess—and I hope the administration did this—whether such an action would have an adverse impact on our national security. Before we march our sons and daughters off to fight another war, we need to make sure we are doing everything possible to prevent the loss of American lives.

I have been clear in opposing a direct confrontation with Iran without—without a clear authorization from Congress. The Trump administration acted without a congressionally approved authorization for the use of military force last week. That is why I and many others have cosponsored Senator TIM KAINE's bipartisan S.J. Res. 68 to prevent the President from going to war with Iran without congressional authorization. If you want to go to war with Iran, you ought to be compelled to vote for it, up or down—vote for or against as a Member of Congress. Specifically, this resolution, S.J. Res. 68, requires the President to ''terminate the use of the United States Armed Forces for hostilities against the Islamic Republican of Iran or any part of its government or military unless explicitly authorized by a declaration of war or a specific authorization for the use of military force'' as enacted by Congress. Nothing in this resolution prevents the United States from ''defending itself against imminent attack.'' Those are the exact words.

It is authorization or declaration before you go to war with Iran. I think a lot of Americans—most Americans—believe that is not just the right thing to do but that is our duty, no matter who is President.

When the administration fails to brief Congress on threats we face and concurrently takes unilateral actions that could lead to all-out war, we must act quickly and decisively to prevent further escalation and demand a strategy. We owe it to Pennsylvanians, and we owe it to all Americans, especially our men and women in uniform and their families, to engage in a substantial, robust public debate on what engaging in hostilities with Iran would mean for U.S. national security and how it could endanger American lives. The House vote of last Thursday was to reassert this congressional authority, and the Senate will vote this week. I urge a vote in support of S.J. Res. 68, which has several bipartisan cosponsors.

This is a dark time, and I cannot overstate my level of concern. I know that concern is shared widely here in Congress but also across the country. As to Iran, we are headed down a path to war, one which could be more bloody, more complicated, and more protracted than any in my lifetime. We have been walking down this path since President Trump pulled out of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. Every week since, we are a little closer to an armed conflict, and the events of these past weeks have likely turbocharged the dangerous path we are on.

Going back to the time of the Vietnam war and thereafter, elected leaders of both political parties have lied to the American people. The American people were told we were making progress, when we weren't. The American people were told that insurgencies were in their ''last throes,'' when the opposite was true. The American people demand that politicians don't make serious mistakes that lead to war.

The good news is, we still have time. We have time to get it right. We have time to engage in hard-nosed diplomacy. We have time to reject a policy of regime change regarding Iran. There is time for this administration to outline and implement an effective Iran strategy that substantially reduces the likelihood of war in a nuclear-armed Iran, but time is running short.

The administration may be committed to a policy of regime change, but the Senate can act. We can pass the bipartisan S.J. Res. 68 and other measures to make sure this administration cannot take us recklessly to war with Iran without congressional authorization or a declaration of war. We owe it to the American people and to our servicemembers to do this.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHINA TRADE DEAL

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, over the past few months, we have spent a great deal of time in this Chamber discussing our adversarial relationships with other countries, but

today I want to draw attention to a truly great economic and foreign policy victory negotiated with one of our adversaries. In fact, it was signed just a few hours ago.

When it comes to trade, we have devoted most of our energy to drafting and promoting the benefits of the USMCA, but we have also gotten a great start on two other trade deals—those that were negotiated with Japan that went into effect January 1 and also with China, signed today. We are looking forward to this Chamber passing the USMCA this week and sending it to the President's desk.

Back home in Tennessee, what I hear from our agriculture community is, we want trade—consistent, dependable, respectful, and fair trade. Entrepreneurs depend on consistent, productive trade relations to keep their businesses up and running and to put food on their employees' tables.

These Tennesseans play a special role in the U.S. relationship with China. In 2017, we exported $2.7 billion worth of goods to China. That is from the State of Tennessee. Imports from China accounted for 7.3 percent of Tennessee's GDP in 2018. They are our third largest trading partner, after Canada and Mexico.

Let me tell you, when things go south with the Chinese, Tennesseans feel the heat because of our ag trade. They are really paying attention to the ins and outs of our dealings with China, the good and the bad. They see the news stories about China's behavior in Hong Kong and Taiwan, about spying, about intellectual property theft, and about those shady apps that children have probably downloaded onto their phones and their tablets. Yes, indeed, they are rightfully concerned. They are concerned because they see all of this in the context of their day-to-day lives, and they know that diplomatic tensions have just as much potential to derail their operations as economic tensions.

Make no mistake—today's signed deal with China is critical because it couples desperately needed relief with backstops that will help to keep our friends in Beijing in line. What does that look like? China agreed to increase purchases of American products and services by at least $200 billion over the next 2 years, which will reduce our trade deficit and take care of our farmers, our energy producers, and our manufacturers. They committed to reducing nontariff barriers to agriculture products and ease restrictions on the approval of new biotechnology.

American producers are covered in terms of free-flowing goods and when it comes to the nuts and bolts of the business of innovation. The phase one deal includes stronger Chinese legal protections for patents, trademarks, and copyrights. We wrote in improved criminal and civil procedures to combat online infringement and the exchange of pirated and counterfeit goods. These are good signs for our creative community in Tennessee. It contains commitments by China to follow through on pledges to eliminate pressure on foreign companies to transfer technology to Chinese firms before they are given market access.

I will tell you, we are going to be keeping an eagle eye on this one as we move to the phase two negotiations. It also includes new pledges by China to refrain from competitive currency devaluations and exchange rate manipulation. All of this is covered by enforcement measures U.S. officials can trigger if we discover Beijing is acting in bad faith.

I will tell you, so many in our agriculture community have said of these enforcement mechanisms that this is what is going to make a difference in their ability to count on trade. Now, these protections are more than just an ace up our sleeve; it is peace of mind for every American who depends on trade to support their family.

So phase one is in the books. What is next? More of the nuts and bolts that I just talked about.

If you have been following the past few years of our relations with China, you know that businesses trying to deal with Beijing run the constant risk of losing control over their own inventions. Intellectual property theft and forced technology transfers have defined China's relationship with foreign businesses. This is what they complain about. They steal those inventions and sometimes actually beat them or match them moving into the marketplace.

In phase two, we will be negotiating a deal that ensures participation in the Chinese market is not dependent on these unbalanced arrangements. Our efforts will be backed by previously passed legislation that enhanced our controls on the export of new technology—like advanced robotics and artificial intelligence—and strengthened reviews of foreign investment in the United States. We know it is an uphill battle. We certainly believe it can be done.

I want to make it clear that no trade deal is ever going to be perfect. It is impossible. However, the first phase of this is a good, solid first step. We are taking care of our producers, taking care of our workers, and opening up the flow of goods and services. We are protecting our innovators in a way that will allow them to prospect in one of the globe's most competitive markets without risking the loss of their intellectual property. We are giving business owners and families peace of mind in the form of enforcement mechanisms that will kick in the moment officials determine our relationship with China is about to go off the rails.

Today, our President signed this deal on behalf of the American people, and I encourage my colleagues to get involved now as we move forward with discussions for phase two.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 406, H.R. 5430.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 406, H.R. 5430, a bill to implement the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada attached as an Annex to the Protocol Replacing the North American Free Trade Agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the title of the bill.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5430) to implement the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada attached as an Annex to the Protocol Replacing the North American Free Trade Agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with section 151 of the Trade Act, there will now be 20 hours of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUERTO RICO

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, a lot is happening right now across our country and in Washington, DC, and in the House and the Senate—and across the globe, for that matter. There are a lot of issues. There is one that has not received the attention it should, which is about a group of Americans who have suffered enormous calamity in the last few days who deserve our attention and our focus.

I am speaking, of course, about the devastation in Puerto Rico. Seismologists report that over 1,200 tremors, earthquakes, and aftershocks have struck the island since January 1. More

than 70 of these were of a magnitude 3.5 or greater. Residents on the island have felt at least 100 of these earthquakes. The largest of the quakes, a magnitude 6.4, struck last Tuesday, taking one life and injuring many others.

More than 2 weeks after the Earth started shaking, these quakes and aftershocks are still going on. In fact, this last weekend, the island was struck by an earthquake with a 5.9 magnitude. Yesterday morning, a 4.6-magnitude tremor could be felt. This morning, there was a 5.1-magnitude quake.

The damage from these quakes is so severe, it can be seen from space. According to NASA, the satellite shows the land in parts of Southern Puerto Rico, near the epicenter of the quake, has moved 5½ inches. That is a very dramatic change in the landscape.

You don't have to be in space; you don't have to have those images or be orbiting the planet and looking down to see the damage because the damage is everywhere. There is $110 million in damages estimated by the Governor's office. Other estimates from the Geological Survey now have the damage approaching $1 billion.

Power has been restored to most of the island, but periodic outages are still happening in different parts of the island, and severe energy conservation is in place.

The Costa Sur plant in the town of Guayanilla was so severely damaged, they are telling us that it will take over a year to get it up and running. That island needs 500 megawatts of emergency generation until that plant is fixed.

As of last Thursday, hundreds of thousands were without water. The world-renowned chef Jose Andres' relief organization World Central Kitchen has served tens of thousands of meals in just the last few days. Buildings and homes have collapsed and been destroyed. Thousands are living outside of their homes, both with the damage done and the damage feared.

It is reported that a total of 559 structures are affected. Look at this picture. Look at this pile of rubble lined up and crossing the street of collapsed buildings, hundreds of piles like that where building, or parts of buildings, once stood. There are 4,000 to 6,000 residents in shelters, thousands sleeping in hammocks or inflatable mattresses and in tents because they are afraid to sleep in their homes.

My heart goes out to the people of Puerto Rico who are enduring yet another natural disaster, while they still have been fighting to rebuild their homes and their lives after the destruction of Hurricane Maria 3 years ago. The truth is, we haven't done nearly enough to help them. Not nearly enough from the last disaster has made it to the island to help them repair all of that damage done. The aid that has come has not come quickly enough.

Indeed, just today, we are hearing that the aid that was supposed to be released no later than last September—$8 billion related to Hurricane Maria—is being released, or at least put in the Federal Register so it can be prepared to be released years after the disaster, when that aid was needed immediately after the disaster to rebuild.

The citizens of Puerto Rico are American citizens. They don't have a vote in this Chamber, and that is a problem we should remedy. What we see is, when citizens don't have a Senator who represents them, there is no one to stand up and advocate with the same ferocity and determination and passion as somebody who is elected by those individuals, so the rest of us need to stand in—Democrats and Republicans, Senators from the South and the North and the East and West—we need to stand in together on behalf of our fellow Americans in this devastated landscape of Puerto Rico.

This neglect of the citizens of Puerto Rico, of this island that is part of America, is staggering. That is why I have joined with Senator SCHUMER and 31 of my Democratic colleagues in a letter to President Trump supporting the Governor of Puerto Rico's request for a major disaster declaration, but this shouldn't be a partisan letter. Let's all join together—Democrats and Republicans together—to fight for the aid that is needed by our fellow citizens.

President Trump signed a declaration that provides only $5 million for immediate emergency services. Five million dollars isn't close to addressing what the Geological Survey says is close to $1 billion in damage. That $5 million is useful, but far more is going to be needed—far more—for removing debris, building temporary shelters, providing electric generators, distributing food and water, providing immediate emergency lifesaving medical care. They are going to need a lot of help, in addition, for long-term rebuilding. A major disaster declaration can help in that. That has not happened. It has been sitting on the desk in the Oval Office since last Saturday.

Let's join together—Democrats and Republicans together—and say: Mr. President, sign that declaration that brings along with it crisis counseling, help rebuilding homes, help repairing roads, help restoring bridges, water control, water supply. Clean water supply is so important to health. Water treatment, which is so important in preventing cholera, job training, aid for businesses—that is the type of thorough, significant assistance the people of Puerto Rico need, and they need it right now, not tomorrow and not a month from now, not years from now. They need it now. I say, let's join together and call on President Trump to sign that major disaster declaration that unleashes this help.

There is a lot going on in the world, a lot here in Washington. We prepare for one of the rare moments in American history where we will be conducting a trial related to Articles of Impeachment. Just a week ago Tuesday, 8 days ago, I was sitting in front of a television very worried about escalation to major war with Iran. There are big issues going on, absolutely, but don't let these big issues prevent us from addressing the plight of our fellow Americans. Let's pay attention. Let's make sure the people of Puerto Rico are neither ignored nor neglected. Swift action is needed. Let's join together and make it happen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

REMEMBERING CHRIS ALLEN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, last week, the Senate Finance Committee and the entire Senate lost a dedicated public servant—and, by the way, an all-around wonderful man—with the unexpected passing of Chris Allen.

Chris had been a member of the Finance Committee tax team since 2018. I was fortunate that he was willing to continue in that role when I reclaimed the gavel last year after the retirement of my friend, and former chairman, Orrin Hatch.

As Members, we are blessed with dedicated people like Chris, who come to Capitol Hill to perform public service. They come here to make a difference, no matter what their party or ideology. They come from all walks of life, religious backgrounds, and from all over the country. They work long hours, and sometimes their work is stymied by the political headwinds we know about in the Congress of the United States. But when an idea is a good one and the people pursuing it do so with a full heart and focused mind, it will eventually become law.

Last year proved to be a year when a number of good ideas finally became law in the area of retirement security, in no small part because of Chris' hard work and dedication.

After more than 3 years, we were finally able to pass the Finance Committee's Retirement Enhancement and Savings Act. We use acronyms around here, and that is RESA. RESA became law after it was incorporated into the Setting Every Community Up for Retirement Enhancement Act, and that acronym is the SECURE Act.

Chris was very instrumental in helping navigate the long and, at times, very contentious process that culminated in this important package of retirement provisions being enacted just before last Christmas.

Possibly even more important, Chris brought a very deep knowledge of multiemployer pensions to bear over the past several years to help us move forward on important reforms.

In the last Congress, Chris served as the staff director of the Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans. Congress formed this committee for the very important job of addressing the impending insolvency of a number of multiemployer plans and the projected insolvency of the multiemployer fund of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

With Chris' steady hand and his tireless efforts, the Joint Select Committee laid a critical foundation in 2018 for addressing the multiemployer pension crisis.

Throughout 2019, Chris carried that work forward as a member of my Finance Committee staff. Through months of work with Finance Committee member offices, and also working with the HELP Committee, working with the PBGC, and, most importantly, stakeholder groups that are affected by any reform we do, Chris was the one leading the effort to build on the Joint Select Committee's work of the previous year. That effort led to the development of the Multiemployer Pension Recapitalization and Reform Plan that Chairman ALEXANDER and I released in November. Resolving the multiemployer pension crisis remains a top priority, and now there is another important reason to see it done in Chris' memory because he put so much effort into where we are at this point.

While Chris has been a key asset to the Finance Committee on retirement and pension policy, his depth of knowledge was much deeper than just that issue. Prior to joining the committee, Chris served as Senator ROBERTS' senior tax policy adviser for 7 years. Chris played a key role in helping us develop and pass the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017. In that effort, he focused heavily on the tax rules affecting farmers and ranchers across the Nation. Farmers and ranchers are a key interest of Senator ROBERTS and the State of Kansas.

A close look at Chris' resume shows that he was very successful in working for the National Association of State Treasurers and then with another organization, the Financial Accounting Foundation. He also worked at other firms linked to his expertise in financial services, regulation, and legislation.

What stands out about Chris is his ability to bring folks with very different views together in the classic legislative process. And boy, I watched him in meetings on the multiemployer pension issues and how he navigated all that, and I thought to myself: Without Chris, this couldn't be done.

He had great ability with numbers and great dedication to public policy. That is what made Chris stand out. I am confident that had the Good Lord not taken Chris last week, he would have remained a fixture on the Finance Committee staff for many years to come. Public service was very simply at the core of Chris' identity as a professional.

A key to Chris' success was his genial nature. You might not know it by looking at him, but he had a very quick wit. It seems like everybody felt comfortable with Chris, and Chris was comfortable with them. He had a lot of contentious meetings. I had a chance to observe some of them and his working with the stakeholders on multiemployer pensions. I saw the comfort they had with him, even when he was trying to go in just a little different direction than certain interest groups might have wanted to go because Chris knew that to get anything done in this body, you have to compromise. As you can tell, policy work was fun for Chris. Policy work was important, and he saw policy work as sustaining over a long period of time.

I hope I am pointing out that this type of goodwill and dedication was infectious. Every day was meaningful. Every day was a source of joy.

As I said in my statement on Friday night after I learned of Chris' passing, Chris was a public servant who brought a deep well of knowledge to his work. We all know he is going to leave behind a legacy of impact on so many lives that he was able to improve with his expertise, with his confidence, and the example he set with his hard work. But he never let that keep him from living life to the fullest, especially where his family was concerned.

You learn these things about a staff member's family with the crisis of a passing, but Chris was a devoted father to two wonderful daughters, Lucie and Sophie. Chris was a loving husband for nearly 30 years to his wife, Lynda-Marie. Chris was a thoughtful and compassionate son and brother. Chris was a fierce friend to so many who came to know him during his 58 years. Chris knew how to live life.

Losing Chris is extremely difficult for all of us. At times, the finger of God reaches down and takes a person who we know and love. It is not for us to know why that happened. What we know is we all got to know Chris and got to know him well. He was part of our lives, and we all benefited from the time that we had with him. We are all blessed to have that.

For his family and the countless others who had the good fortune to know and work with Chris Allen, a piece of him will live on with each of us in every memory of him. Whether it was of Chris' positivity and sincerity, or the endless way he could inject humor into a very difficult situation, Chris was a blessing to those who were fortunate enough to know him.

Rest in peace, my friend, Chris Allen.

God bless Chris' family and may He show them His grace as they take these next steps in their own life's path.

Chris will be greatly missed.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor after Speaker PELOSI has ended her delay of the Senate impeachment trial today.

For the past month, the American people have watched the Speaker, I believe, make a spectacle of herself. They talked about the need to pass this in a way that was rushed, that was partisan, that was sloppy, but they had to get it done. Their key word from the Speaker and from so many in the House was ''urgency.'' We have to get this done, they said—urgency, urgency, urgency. So they took the vote in the House before Christmas. Then the Speaker decided to sit on this for 4 long weeks. She blocked the moving of the articles from the House to the Senate by refusing to send over the necessary papers.

In the end, the American people, including key Members of the Democrats in the Senate, realized that this was just a political stunt. Even the Senate Democrats lost patience with her cynical scheming. The American people saw what this was. A Harvard-Harris poll cites that 56 percent of Americans say that what she was doing was just a political stunt. We are talking about the impeachment of the President of the United States, but it was just a political stunt. She should have done her job. She should have delivered the articles in a timely manner.

Nevertheless, the Senate Republicans are ready to move forward today. We have the majority's support to adopt the rules that were used in the impeachment trial of President Clinton. President Trump deserves the same treatment. In 1999, all 100 Senators—all 100—including the Democratic leader, Senator SCHUMER, voted for these rules, and 77 percent of the American public says: Hey, if it is good enough for Clinton, we ought to do the same thing today. So, after making his own, unreasonable demands for weeks, Senator SCHUMER now says he is ready to begin the trial.

The truth is that the Democrats have already made a mockery of impeachment. What they really want is a show trial, not a fair trial, and that is what happened in the House of Representatives. It was all for show. What do I mean by that? Let's take a look at what happened in the House.

First of all, their hearings were in secret, behind closed doors, in the basement of the Capitol. Then they selectively released misleading information. They denied the President due process, and they denied the President the opportunity to face his accusers and to face the whistleblower. Even though there was immediate interest and, at first, they said ''Oh, the whistleblower will testify,'' they then said ''No, no, no. We don't want you to even know who the whistleblower is or what reason or personal issues related to the whistleblower may have brought forth the reason for that person to come forward. We don't want you to know where the whistleblower's alliances may lie.''

The Democrats have always known they cannot remove this President.

Their real agenda is the 2020 Presidential election and the Senate elections. Thankfully, the Democrats' 3-year-long partisan impeachment effort—their goal being to impeach from day No. 1—is finally nearing an end. It was from day No. 1. We saw ELIZABETH WARREN, candidate for President, on the debate stage last night. Yet, in December of 2016, after Donald Trump had been elected but before he had even been sworn in, she had held a press conference and had talked about impeaching him.

On the day the President took the oath of office, there was a headline in the Washington Post that read: ''The campaign to impeach President Trump has begun.''

Here we are now, over 3 years since election day of 2016, and we are getting ready to have votes in Iowa in less than 3 weeks. So this isn't really about trying to remove President Trump from office; it is about trying to influence the vote of 2020. With voting in Iowa being 3 weeks away and the general election's not being far away—November 3—voters, not Congress, are going to decide whether to keep President Trump in office.

The President has a terrific record to stand on. There have been 7 million new jobs created since he has been elected. The President has cut taxes and gutted regulations that have been punishing to the economy. There have been trade deals. He is signing one with China today, and there are additional trade deals. We are going to pass the USMCA tomorrow. There is a new trade deal with Japan. Unemployment is at an all-time low. There is a 50-year low in unemployment in this country, and wages are going up.

It is time for the Democrats to stop wasting the time of the American people. There are jobs that need to be done. Congress needs to get its job done, which is to focus on the issues that the American public care about—roads, highways, bridges, tunnels, infrastructure. There is key legislation we need to be advancing, like lowering the costs of prescription drugs—helping people get insulin that is cheaper for them. We need to help those families. We need to secure the border. That is what is going on.

To think that we are going to spend the amount of time that we are going to spend on impeachment as a result of what the House has been doing and the Democrats have been doing since day No. 1 is a misuse of taxpayer money and is a misuse of Congress's time to do the job that we were elected to do—to help the American people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I rise in support of S.J. Res. 68, to prevent an unnecessary and unauthorized war against Iran.

I thank my friend from Virginia, Senator KAINE, as well as Senators DICK DURBIN, MIKE LEE, and RAND PAUL, for standing up for our laws and for the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress, not the President, the power to make war and to authorize the use of military force.

The assassination of Iranian General Soleimani was a massive, deliberate, and dangerous escalation of conflict with Iran by Donald Trump. Rather than deterring new attacks on American interests, as the administration insists, Soleimani's assassination invited them, and they came in the form of airstrikes on U.S. air bases in Iraq.

But instead of sharing with Congress and the American people information and intelligence that justify the Soleimani attack, President Trump and his counselors have deflected, fabricated, and just plain refused to tell the truth about the so-called imminent threat that was prevented.

We now have press reports confirming that President Trump authorized the killing of General Soleimani 7 months ago. The administration doesn't just look to be misrepresenting the imminent threat of Soleimani, it appears to be fabricating information intended to bypass Congress's constitutional role to authorize war.

Last week, President Trump revealed more information on the killing to a FOX News personality, and he gave more information to that personality on FOX than he did in a 75-minute briefing to the entire U.S. Senate. That is completely and totally unacceptable. FOX News should not know more about our national security interests than the 100 Senators who sit here and have the responsibility to ensure that we are a check and balance on the executive branch.

No evidence has yet been presented to support President Trump's outlandish claim that Iran would ''probably'' target four U.S. Embassies—an assertion that was contradicted days later by his own Secretary of Defense. Perhaps that is why President Trump's latest defense is just to simply throw up his hands and say: I am sorry; I am not giving you the information that you need. He tweets that the imminence test ''doesn't really matter because of [Soleimani's] horrible past.'' So it is no longer imminent threat, from his perspective, because he says it really doesn't matter. He decides, and he decides without consultation with the Congress.

Here is the lesson Donald Trump seems unwilling or unable to learn: The truth does matter. In matters of war and peace, the truth is nonnegotiable.

Trump's reckless actions have put tens of thousands of American Armed Forces, diplomats, and civilians at greater risk, and his continued fabrications about intelligence threaten to draw the United States into an illegal war with the country of Iran.

Look at what has happened as a result of Trump's escalation: Our Iraqi strategic partners are demanding that U.S. troops leave bases in Iraq prematurely, increasing the chance that ISIS will reconstitute itself in the region. The truth matters.

Iran has announced that it is no longer bound by enrichment restrictions under the deal. This only makes it more likely that Iran will hasten its quest for a nuclear bomb. The truth matters.

Despite Donald Trump's best efforts, the United States is a country that abides by the rule of law. Our laws say Congress has the sole authority to make and to authorize war. Neither the 2001 nor the 2002 authorizations for the use of military force can be used to provide legal cover for a war with Iran, and we owe it to the American people to repeal these obsolete authorizations, which Presidents of both political parties have abused to justify military campaigns in far-flung parts of the planet.

To guard against another quagmire as we experienced in Vietnam, Congress acted, through the War Powers Resolution of 1973, to rein in Presidential overreach when it came to war. That resolution, which informs our debate on the Senate floor today, makes it clear that the President cannot put our brave men and women in harm's way without a vote by Congress or if there is an armed attack on the United States.

Neither the 2001 nor the 2002 authorization for the use of military force provides legal cover for the killing of Soleimani or any other future attacks against the country of Iran.

It bears repeating that a possible war with Iran did not begin with Iran's attack on the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad, nor did it begin with the President's decision to select the extreme option of assassinating Soleimani. The uptick in Iran's attacks in the region and that of its proxies can be traced to President Trump's unilateral and irresponsible exit from the Iran nuclear deal—the deal to put inspectors in every one of the Iranian nuclear facilities. The Iran deal was working. It was the best tool we have to ensure Iran never obtains a nuclear weapon—that was until Trump's capricious decision to pull out of the deal and crush Iran by ratcheting up American sanctions.

Trump is now doubling down on his failed approach by ratcheting up sanctions on new sectors of the Iranian economy. This escalation will make the Trump deal that he says he wants all the more elusive.

Before the United States backed out of the Iran deal, the President's own CIA Director, Director of National Intelligence, and the United Nation's international watchdog agency all said Iran was upholding its end of the deal. Iran was upholding its end of the nuclear deal. Since then, however, Iran

has moved away from its nuclear-related commitments in phases. Most worrisome was Iran's announcement last week that it was no longer bound by enrichment restrictions under the deal.

But we can still salvage a diplomatic outcome. All of Iran's steps are reversible. For one, Iran remains party to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, requiring it to foreswear acquisition of a nuclear bomb. Additionally, international inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency maintain access to Iranian nuclear sites to detect and deter any ramp-up in enrichment or reprocessing.

But pulling the United States back into a position where we are not going to war will require a change in strategy by the President of the United States. It means a commitment from the President to, one, cease any further military action, as today's resolution calls for; two, engage in talks with Iranian President Hasan Ruhani or other senior leaders to defuse the crisis and to support our allies as they work in good faith to preserve the Iran nuclear deal; three, make clear that the United States does not seek to impose regime change in Iran—the future of Iran must be decided by the Iranian people alone; and four, cease any and all threats against Iranian cultural sites and civilians. These would be war crimes. Destroying cultural sites is what ISIS does. It is what the Taliban does. It is what the Chinese Government does. That is not who we are in the United States of America. Finally, we must repeal the 2001 and 2002 authorizations for the use of military force immediately.

Americans strongly reject President Trump's deliberate and escalatory action against Iran. They do so not just because it is wrong, but they do not want to get embroiled into another costly war in the Middle East without end. A poll last week shows that Americans by more than 2 to 1 say that the killing of General Soleimani has made the United States less safe. Sadly, they are right.

In passing Senator KAINE's resolution, this body has a chance to reclaim our Founders' vision for the proper role of Congress. We are the direct representatives of the people. Congress must express the will of the people to determine when, where, and against whom our country decides to go to war.

We cannot and must not get pulled into war with Iran, and we cannot allow Trump to start a war all on his own.

I thank Senator KAINE for his leadership on this resolution that I call upon all of my colleagues here on the Senate floor to support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, what is the business now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is H.R. 5430, the USMCA bill.

H.R. 5430

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this afternoon, the Finance Committee is kicking off this debate. I will have some remarks, and then the distinguished chairman of the committee, Senator GRASSLEY, will have some remarks, and Senator BROWN, who has played such a key role in the enforcement issues, will follow.

I am glad we are getting on this debate. There is a lot to say about this topic, and I want to talk first about how the new NAFTA got to this point.

In the 2016 Presidential campaign, then-candidate Trump said he was going to pull the United States out of NAFTA. He said it was ''the worst trade deal maybe ever signed anywhere, but certainly ever signed in this country.''

As President, Donald Trump went in a different direction. After negotiating with Canada and Mexico, the Trump administration announced a deal in 2018 that actually doubled down on several key mistakes of the original NAFTA. The new NAFTA the Trump administration came up with was way, way too weak on enforcement of the trade laws. Here in the Senate, we Democrats said it wasn't good enough—not even close—to get through the Congress. So we got down to work and we fixed it.

The bill we will be considering is the end product of all that work. This legislation is now the first real measure of certainty and predictability on the crucial issue of trade which American workers, our businesses, and families have. It is the first real measure of certainty and predictability since the beginning of the Trump administration.

It now has the strongest trade enforcement system ever written into a trade agreement. There are significant new resources put into protecting American workers. Unfortunately, there has been an effort by a few on the other side to strip the crucial enforcement resources for enforcing the rights of workers and protecting the environment. It is masquerading under a whole lot of procedural lingo, but it is really a trojan horse to go back to business as usual with weak enforcement of trade laws that doesn't get the job done.

Over the last week—and I see the distinguished chairman of the committee here—these procedural gimmicks have been opposed by the chairman and myself. I want to thank the chairman this afternoon for doing so. For decades, there has been a lot of happy talk in Washington about enforcing trade laws, but the government just moved too slowly and did too little to protect American workers when trade cheats came after their jobs. Workers and businesses were forced to wait for years for the government to crack down on the rip-off artists, and so often it was too late. Workers were laid off, factories were shuttered, and communities were left without a beating economic heart.

The original NAFTA was a part of the problem. It made strong enforcement almost impossible and was particularly a problem with labor rights in Mexico. The same government that allowed corporations to undercut American jobs by paying rock bottom wages and abusing rights in Mexico had the power to actually block our country from fighting back for the workers. So it was a head-scratcher when the Trump administration proposed essentially a new NAFTA that kept the old NAFTA enforcement system. It ought to have been the first part of the original NAFTA that they threw in the trash can, but, sure enough, in 2018, the Trump administration agreed to language on trade enforcement that really did not enforce anything.

So Senator BROWN, who has fought for years for tough trade law enforcement, said: We are going to get together, and we are going to change this. We put together a proposal that makes the U.S. enforcement system faster, tougher, and directly responsive to American workers and businesses that are targeted by the trade cheats. Our approach puts trade enforcement boots on the ground to identify when factories in Mexico break the labor standards we should insist on. It will be a lot easier to penalize the violators and protect the jobs they threaten to undercut. Senator BROWN and I worked with our colleagues, Democratic colleagues on the Finance Committee, but we talked to plenty of Republicans as well. We took our ideas to the House leadership. We got their input and support. We told the Trump administration that tough enforcement with what has come to be known as the Brown-Wyden proposal was going to be a prerequisite to getting the new NAFTA through Congress. As I said, I think this is the toughest labor enforcement measure that our country has seen, and that is a big reason why the AFL–CIO has endorsed the bill.

When you combine this all-in approach to enforcement with significant new standards on labor and environmental protection, you also get the benefit of beginning to stop the race to the bottom. You raise other countries to the standards set by our country instead of forcing American workers to compete in a game that is rigged against them.

These have been core Democratic trade policies for a long time. Commitments on labor and the environment weren't a part of the original NAFTA. Those issues were just pushed aside into what was essentially called a side letter. They were the trade policy equivalent of a pinky swear and about as easy to enforce. Now they are going to be at the heart of the agreement. The United States will have more power than ever to hold Mexico and Canada to the commitments made in this legislation.

On technology and digital trade, something that I put an enormous amount of my time into, the new NAFTA redefines what trade policy will be about. Digital trade wasn't even

a part of the original NAFTA because, by and large, it didn't exist. Smartphones were science fiction. The internet was still years away.

Senator GRASSLEY has heard me say this many times. The internet was years away from becoming the shipping lane of the 21st century. The problem has been that our trade laws were still stuck in the Betamax mindset.

Technology and digital trade are obviously at the core of a modern economy. They account for millions of good-paying jobs. They are woven into every major American industry you can think of—healthcare, education, manufacturing, agriculture, and the list goes on. So when the United States fights for strong rules on digital trade, it is fighting to protect ''red, white, and blue'' jobs.

That is why the new NAFTA helps to protect our intellectual property and prevent shakedowns of American businesses for their valuable ideas. It also includes something that I felt very strongly about, and that is it established U.S. law that protects small technology entrepreneurs that want to build successful lasting businesses in a field that is now dominated by just a few Goliaths.

It is long past time for the United States to bring its trade policy into the modern digital world. Getting smart digital trade laws on the books is not just about boosting exports. What the internet looks like in 10, 20, or 50 years is going to be an open question. Will it be an open venue for communication among people around the world or will more governments follow the lead of China, Russia, Turkey, and Iran, because what they are talking about could fracture the internet around national borders. Will the internet be a platform for free speech or will Chinese officials and corporations find new ways to reach across the ocean and trample on the rights of the American people?

These are just a few of the important questions the United States will have to confront when it comes to technology.

In my view, locking in digital trade rules that protect our jobs and promote free speech and commerce online is a good place to start. Labor rights, environmental protection, rules on technology and digital trade, and aggressive enforcement to protect American workers are all areas where there has been significant improvement in the new NAFTA. I call this ''trade done right.''

My State, along with Senator GRASSLEY's State, is so dependent on trade. One out of four jobs in Oregon revolves around international trade. They often pay better than do the non-trade jobs because they have a higher value-added component. Most of them are small businesses, and they export. Agriculture is a big part of our economy. The new NAFTA will put more of our wine on shelves outside the United States. It will increase dairy exports. It will end unfair practices that discriminate against American-grown wheat.

Oregon companies that sell services like apps and engineering plans to customers overseas will have new protections under the digital trade rules. It will help our manufacturers because the new NAFTA raises the bar and includes those protections on labor rights I have described.

There are a lot of Members to thank who pitched in. We are going to hear from a number of them on the floor, and I am going to thank them before we wrap up.

I will close with this. The last few years have delivered one trade gut punch after another to our farmers, our shippers, our manufacturers, and our exporters. The administration has driven away traditional economic allies. A lot of manufacturers are hurting. Farm bankruptcies have surged. Foreign markets are more closed off—many of them to American exports—than they were before the Trump administration began. With this legislation we have an opportunity to begin—and I want to underline that, to begin—to change that.

I particularly want to thank Senator BROWN for his laser focus and leadership on the issue of enforcement. I think Senator CANTWELL, who will speak on this issue soon, has done a particularly good job about trying to build an infrastructure for enforcing our trade laws. I think it is only appropriate to have a special Senate shoutout for Ambassador Lighthizer, who has been straight with members of our committee. I know the chairman will speak on that next. I call him the hardest working man in the trade agreement debate.

I support this bill. I hope my colleagues will do it. I know the chairman will have remarks, and Senator BROWN will be here. Other colleagues will be here. I know Chairman GRASSLEY is glad we are getting at this. I share his views.

We have plenty to do on healthcare and other issues, and we look forward to working with him.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, before I start my remarks, I think it is important for all Senators to know that when there were negotiations going on between the White House and the Democrats in the House of Representatives, one of the real sticking points was enforcement. I think everybody expects a trade agreement to be enforced, but a lot more had to be done than what was originally agreed to when the agreement was signed.

I want to recognize Senator WYDEN and Senator BROWN because months before, maybe even years before—I don't want to take away from how hard they were working on some ways of improving enforcement—but at least they had an idea out there that was salable to both sides. I don't know whether it was 100 percent or 90 percent or 80 percent that was incorporated in this bill, but their laying the groundwork was the basis for getting an agreement between the White House and the House of Representatives so we could move this to the point where the Senate is going to pass it tomorrow, I hope. So I thank Senator WYDEN and Senator BROWN, who is not here, but maybe you can tell him I said thank you.

Mr. WYDEN. I will.

Mr. GRASSLEY. It is said that good things come to those who wait. Others say it is better late than never. Either way, we can agree that this day has been a long time coming.

With the passage of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement by what will be an overwhelming margin here in the U.S. Senate, America's economy will continue to thrive and drive prosperity for hard-working American farmers, workers, and taxpayers all across our economy.

You have heard the old saying: ''A rising tide lifts all boats.'' The new NAFTA, the bill that we are working on, puts a bigger oar in the water for our trilateral trade relationship with our northern and southern neighbors. It is important to point out that we wouldn't be here without the bold leadership and the determination of President Trump. The President is doing exactly what he said he would do.

So many people running for President run on a platform, but they don't stand on that platform. He ran on a platform of doing something about what he considered were bad trade agreements, and, of course, he is standing on that platform.

Undaunted by those who set to throw him out of office since day one, President Trump forged ahead for the good of the American people. He forged ahead to update and improve NAFTA for Americans. We heard, during the campaign, that it was the President's opinion that it is the worst agreement that has ever been made. I might not agree with the extreme of that, but I do know, as Senator WYDEN has pointed out, that there were a lot of things that weren't even negotiable 30 years ago when we first sought NAFTA, and at least an updating needed to be done.

The President has done more than update. As the President promised during his campaign, at the end of the day, President Trump successfully steered that final trade pact into the 21st century. He did so with a tireless and tenacious team of advisers, especially the leadership of the U.S. Trade Representative, Bob Lighthizer. Senator WYDEN just gave more adjectives to Bob Lighthizer's work, and I associate myself with the remarks and the description that Senator WYDEN gave to Bob Lighthizer's heavy lift to get this job done because Bob Lighthizer worked in good faith to broker and fine-tune the USMCA.

Mr. Lighthizer built a strong and sweeping coalition to strengthen and

expand markets for U.S. agriculture, manufacturing, and service exports. Mr. Lighthizer built a broad and sweeping coalition to improve labor and environmental protections in a balanced fashion, and Mr. Lighthizer built a broad and sweeping coalition that will end up growing wages for our workers. He ensured that all of this would be subject to strong enforcement, which is the bedrock of any good trade agreement, and it is in that enforcement that he took good ideas from Wyden and Brown.

Unfortunately, these efforts that I just described to you became entangled in a time-wasting partisan roadblock from the House of Representatives. It is unfortunate for the American people, especially our farmers, ranchers, and workers, that public policymaking took a back seat to a partisan obsession of impeaching the 45th President. That is a shame.

The President is upholding his promise to put America and Americans first. His message resonates with tens of millions of Americans who want to restore the American dream for their children and grandchildren. These Americans want the next generation to have the same opportunity to lay claim to the American dream that nine generations before, going back to the Colonies, have built upon so that each generation can live better than the preceding generation.

That American dream is that if you work hard and play by the rules, you can earn a good living, get ahead, and stay ahead. A big plank in President Trump's platform is fixing broken trade agreements. USMCA is not the first of it because he has worked with Japan, and he has worked with Korea, and today we saw the signing of phase one of the Chinese agreement, so he is making great progress.

The President is determined to stop America's farmers and manufacturers and workers and consumers from being taken for a ride. When it comes to unfair trade agreements, we are finding out now that the buck stops with President Trump. I am not sure, 3 years ago, I would have said that, but I think after 3 years and USMCA, the Chinese agreement, the Korean agreement, the Japanese agreement, and some other things he has done in trade, he ought to wake everybody up that what he ran on in his platform he has carried out.

With NAFTA, when it took effect 26 years ago this month, the digital economy and the commercialization of the internet didn't even exist. The USMCA creates the first U.S. free trade agreement with a digital trade chapter. These important measures will help the $1.3 trillion U.S. digital economy to flourish and grow faster. It improves efforts to stop importers of counterfeit goods from ripping off consumers, producers, and content creators. It provides for copyright and patent protections to uphold trade secrets and to secure data rights so that American ingenuity and innovation will drive economic growth, create jobs, drive up consumer choices, and drive down prices for goods and services our consumers need.

The USMCA levels the playing field for the U.S. auto industry by encouraging companies to use more North American content and higher wage labor. USMCA also fixes enforcement flaws that hog-tied NAFTA from keeping everyone accountable to their commitments.

Speaking of hogs, the new NAFTA is good news for American farmers and ranchers. My State of Iowa happens to benefit from this to a great extent because my State is the Nation's No. 1 pork producer. In 2018, Canada and Mexico bought more than 40 percent of U.S. pork exports. These exports support 16,000 U.S. jobs.

USMCA preserves critical, duty-free access to Mexico and Canada. It removes unfair restrictions on U.S. farm and food products. For the first time ever, U.S. eggs and dairy exports will be sold in Canada. This is very good news. It means an additional $227 million for dairy exports to Canada and $50.6 million of exports into Mexico. My home State of Iowa also is the No. 1 egg producer in the country. USMCA will increase U.S. exports of poultry and eggs to Canada by $207 million. It also addresses restrictions that kept U.S. wheat and wine out of Canada.

I thank the former Iowa Governor and previous Agriculture Secretary, Tom Vilsack, because, as the leading Democrat in the State of Iowa, he set aside partisan motives embraced by other Members of his party to work together with Senator ERNST, Governor Kim Reynolds, and me to champion USMCA.

According to the U.S. International Trade Commission, the USMCA will raise real GDP by more than $68 billion, and USMCA will create nearly 176,000 jobs. So, all told, the trade pact is forecast to boost farm and food exports by at least $2.2 billion. Considering the slump in the farm economy, it is really shameful that passage of the USMCA was stalled for over a year and nearly derailed by a partisan agenda, including the impeachment.

Under the Trump economy, the United States is enjoying the longest economic expansion in U.S. history. Ratification of the USMCA will help America's economic engine fire on all cylinders and refuel prosperity in rural America.

If you remember, I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks that passage of the USMCA is better late than never, and while I am looking forward, I also take this opportunity to call on Canada to quickly ratify the agreement. Now that Mexico has ratified and the United States will soon be done with our ratification, all eyes will be on Canada to get the job done quickly so that we can all work together to implement this agreement. I don't have any doubt that Canada is going to do that because I had opportunities earlier last year, several times, to visit with the Canadian Foreign Minister, and she was very certain that they would be passing this.

Let's not delay the people's business on other important matters before us, such as drug pricing and retirement and pension legislation that would provide peace of mind for Americans for their healthcare and financial security.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, tomorrow I will do something I have never done in my time in the House and Senate. I will vote for a trade agreement for the first time in my career. I am voting for that trade agreement because of the work my colleague from Oregon Senator WYDEN and I did to fix President Trump's deal and secure new protections for American workers for the first time ever, in spite of the President's intransigence, in spite of the President's lining up, as he always does, with corporate interests.

Our trade agreement, for the first time ever—ever—put workers at the center of this agreement. Every trade agreement I have seen in my time in Congress—the North American Free Trade Agreement, the Central America Free Trade Agreement, the trade agreements with Colombia, South Korea, and Panama, the permanent normal trade relation with China—one after another, every one of these trade agreements, every one of these trade actions were written fundamentally in secret by corporate interests to serve corporate interests. Workers were never at the center of these trade agreements.

One of my proudest votes in the House was against the North American Free Trade Agreement. I have voted no ever since. Again, it is because all of these trade agreements were written by corporations to maximize profits and compensation for executives and to enrich stockholders, always at the expense of workers and at the expense of communities like Mansfield, Portsmouth, Toledo, and Youngstown, OH.

I was talking to a friend of mine in Trumbull County, former Senator Cafaro. She knows what has happened with these trade agreements. We all know how they undermine communities and hurt workers, always, again, because these trade agreements were written by corporations in secret.

We have watched the spread of the corporate business model because of NAFTA and these trade agreements and because of the Trump tax policies, where you pay a lower tax rate if you

move overseas than you pay in the United States, and in spite of, in those days, Ranking Member WYDEN's efforts to stop those kinds of tax breaks that go to the richest people in the country.

With those business models, you shut down production in Lima or in Zanesville or in Cleveland, OH. You get a tax break, you move overseas, and then you sell your products back in the United States. That has been the business model based on our trade policy for years.

Candidate Trump promised something different. He promised to renegotiate NAFTA. The problem is, when he put his agreement in front of us, it was the same old, same old. They were the same old economic policies that, again, put corporate interests in the center of this trade agreement. It was a trade policy that was like all of our trade policies in the past.

Over and over again, this President has betrayed workers, from tax giveaways to corporations, to his judges who put their thumbs on the scale, always supporting corporate interests and putting corporations over workers and always supporting Wall Street over consumers.

As we know, down the hall, where Senator MCCONNELL's office is—almost every day he walks down here to try to confirm far-right extremist judges, always young judges who do that same thing: put their thumb on the scales of justice, always supporting corporations over workers.

As I said, last year, we got an initial draft of President Trump's agreement. It was another betrayal. His first NAFTA draft was nowhere near the good deal that the President promised. He had negotiated, pure and simple, another corporate trade deal. It meant nothing for workers, and it was a sellout to drug companies. In fact, the White House looks like a retreat for Wall Street executives, except on Tuesdays and Fridays, when the White House looks like a retreat for drug company executives.

It took us—Senator WYDEN and Speaker PELOSI and unions—months and months and months working together to improve this deal. The President resisted and resisted and resisted, but we finally approved a deal to put workers at the center of our trade policy.

We have a provision that Senator WYDEN and I will talk about that says violence against workers is a violation of the agreement. It might sound obvious, but it has never been in a trade deal before. For the first time ever, we spell out workers' right to strike. Again, it should be obvious, but it was never included before.

If the workers don't have that right to strike—not something workers want to do very often, if ever. My wife, whose dad was a utility worker in the union for 35 years, talks about growing up. They went on strike twice when she was a kid. Workers never really recover from a strike, but sometimes they have to. It needs to be in trade agreements to make sure workers' rights are protected.

We have improved some of the legalese that, since the beginning, has been included in our trade agreements to make it nearly impossible to win a case when a country violates its labor commitments.

Most importantly, we secured our Brown-Wyden provision that amounts to the strongest ever labor enforcement—ever—in a U.S. trade deal. The provision Senator WYDEN and I wrote and fought for is the first improvement to enforcing the labor standards in our trade agreements since we have been negotiating them.

We know why companies close factories in Ohio, in Oregon, and open them in Mexico. They pay lower wages, and they take advantage of workers who don't have rights. They have weaker and nonexistent environmental laws.

American workers can't compete when companies move overseas and exploit low-wage workers. We essentially get a race to the bottom on wages. The only way to stop this is by raising labor standards in every country we buy and sell to and in every country with which we trade and export and import, raising labor standards, making sure those standards are actually enforced.

If corporations are forced to pay workers a living wage and treat them with dignity and really honor the dignity of work no matter where those workers are located, then we take away the incentives to move jobs overseas.

Think about this. The missions of companies in the United States state—it is sort of the business practice of shutting down production in Niles, OH, and moving it overseas. They will be less likely to do that if the workers overseas are paid decent wages. Then those workers will be able to buy our products because they are more likely to be in the middle class.

That is what Brown-Wyden is all about. It is a completely new way of holding corporations accountable. A worker in Mexico will be able to report if a company violated their rights. Within months, we can determine whether workers' rights have been violated, and we take action against that company.

We apply punitive damages when companies cheat, break the law, stop workers from organizing, and if they keep doing it, the final strong enforcement is we stop their goods from coming into the United States. In essence, we say: OK. You are cheating. You are breaking the law. You are violating your workers' rights. You are not going to have access to the U.S. market. That is enforcement.

When Mexican workers have the power to form real unions and negotiate for higher wages, it helps our workers. Mexican workers right now can be paid as little as $6.50 a day. The minimum wage per hour in our country—in Tennessee, Oregon, and Ohio—is higher than that. This is $6.50 a day. We have been asking American workers to compete with that.

We have already heard some critics say Brown-Wyden will force Mexican wages to rise. I know a lot of CEOs who make $7 million, $8 million year who want to keep wages low in other countries. They accuse us of forcing Mexican wages to rise. That is kind of the point. That is what we want to do because it takes away incentives for those CEOs—those $7 million, $8 million, $9 million-a-year CEOs in America—from looking abroad to hire cheap labor and to exploit workers and make more money for themselves.

I want to especially thank Senator WYDEN and his staff. Without his endorsing the proposal and without his pushing aggressively, we would not be here.

I want to be clear, though. We will be straight with American workers. It is not a perfect agreement. One trade deal that the Democrats fixed, over the President's opposition, is not going to bring back auto plants like the President promises.

I have real concerns that the auto rules of origin are much weaker than the administration says they are. We know the administration always exaggerates its successes and doesn't tell the truth about many of the things it does.

We know that this trade agreement was a corporate trade agreement and not a worker trade agreement. Now workers are at the center. We will be watching the President. He needs to ensure companies actually comply with these rules. I will demand we strengthen them if we need to.

One trade deal the Democrats fixed also will not undo the rest of President Trump's economic policies. It is a policy that, as I said, put corporations over workers. We haven't raised the minimum wage because the President is opposed. The President took overtime pay away from 50,000 Ohioans by changing the rule on how overtime is paid. This deal is not going to fix all that.

This USMCA is not going to stop outsourcing when we have President Trump's tax plan that gives companies a tax break to send jobs overseas.

I am going to keep fighting President Trump's corporate trade policies and tax policy, just as we did with this agreement. We have more work to do to make our trade agreements more pro-worker.

I will vote yes. As I said at the outset, I will vote yes for the first time ever on a trade agreement because, by including Brown-Wyden, Democrats have taken another corporate trade deal brought to us by President Trump and Democrats have made this agreement much more pro-worker. As the Senator from Oregon knows, we have set an important precedent that Brown-Wyden will be included—must

be included—in every future trade agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to pose some questions to my colleague from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. He has done so much work on these issues—not just in the last few months but for years and years. I want to thank him for his extraordinary commitment to the rights of workers and to all these communities that, he has pointed out, essentially lose their economic heartbeat by trade policies that cheat workers.

I want to ask the gentleman about this. I have heard this, and I have heard this in lots of places. People have said: These ideas seem good, but are they really that consequential?

Mr. BROWN has been at this for more than a quarter of a century. We have watched him out on the floor year after year after year. Let me give my calculation of what this package which we have worked on and which he deserves so much credit for consists of.

As far as I can tell—and we have worked on it with the staff—this is the fastest enforcement process by more than 300 percent because of what the Senator has done to speed up the timeline for protecting workers. It is the toughest because for the first time it allows our country to hit the worst actor the hardest by stopping rip-off artists at the individual factory level. It is the strongest because it allows us to hit companies that repeatedly violate the law. We are able to stop the products of exploitive labor at the border.

I want to ask the Senator a couple of questions, but I wanted to give this overview first. Having been at this for more than a quarter of a century, is there any trade enforcement regime that, in terms of those specifics, comes close to what that new regime would consist of?

Mr. BROWN. I thank Senator WYDEN. I thank him for his help in putting this all together.

Not even close. We have seen trade agreement after trade agreement that simply is not—even when labor standards look fairly strong, they are not ever really enforceable. Part of what we recognized—we went back and looked at what happened after NAFTA was passed, and not just what people promised but what happened with NAFTA and what happened with CAFTA. We have seen that, with any attempts at labor enforcement, the companies or the governments that don't want to enforce labor laws find a way, as lawyers are very good at doing, of just taking forever. They slow-walk. So whenever you push them to do something, they end up staying in court.

There was a Central American case in Guatemala, I believe, that went on for 7 or 8 years. You know the old saying: Justice delayed is justice denied. You can't really get enforcement if the people who have done the violation, who have committed the violation, take forever.

So speed is one of the things. Mr. WYDEN mentioned at the outset how important that is. Another part of it is and one of the things we knew would speed it up, No. 1, and would mean that enforcement would work was that the workers would have an ability to kick off the investigation, to literally call a toll-free number. They can register that they have seen child labor violations; that they have seen workers attacked, violence aimed against workers; that they have seen wages denied for all kinds of illegal reasons. So workers can speak out and band together and go to a panel and get quick action.

If a company keeps doing it—we found cases where a company would get a little slap on the wrist. They would do it again and get a slap on the wrist and then do it again. So what we did was we increased the penalties. The first time, they get fined. The fine is proportional to the violation, so it is not a huge penalty. The second time, it is more. The third time, we can deny that company NAFTA benefits if they sell in the United States.

Essentially, if you break the law, if you attack workers, if you keep out the union illegally, if you deny pay to workers who have earned it, you are going to see your market dry up in the United States. That is the best incentive to stop. We literally keep the product out of the market, out of the United States, if you are a serial cheater and a company that does that to its workers.

Mr. WYDEN. I appreciate Mr. BROWN's taking us through this. It is faster. It is tougher because it gets at the individual factory level. It is stronger because it stops those repeat offenders who come up with products using exploitive labor.

I want people to know and have it highlighted in the RECORD that my take is that this, given what we have seen over the last 25 years, is far better than anything we have seen before.

Look, the Senator and I have worked on a lot of enforcement efforts over the years. He will recall that at one point I chaired the Trade Subcommittee, and we found people tripping over themselves to cheat because they were merchandise laundering. It was a little bit different from this. We set up a dummy website just to try to keep tabs on all the people who were cheating. We would remember—and we didn't know whether to laugh or cry—that all over the world, people were coming forward to cheat. That was useful. It didn't come close to the breadth of what has been done here.

Let me just ask a couple more specific questions because I have heard lots of people in all the campaigns and the like talking about whether this was modest or really a bold set of changes. Now we have just walked through how much stronger this is than anything we have seen in the last quarter-century.

The gentleman mentioned how workers can use this hotline to enforce their rights. If a worker reports violations of their rights at a call center and the government believes the complaint has merit, my understanding is that the government is obligated under the law to send labor inspectors to that facility. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWN. Yes. Whether it is a call center or an auto factory, if the violations occur and there is evidence that there are violations—and in many cases, we know about them because workers have spoken out—then inspectors can go into those factories.

One of the outcomes of this: We know corporations don't want that kind of punishment. We know corporations don't want to see inspectors there looking at their businesses because there have been legitimate, reasonable accusations of lawbreaking. So that is going to mean that corporations will probably quit breaking the law.

Those corporations that have decided to move to Mexico because it is easy to evade labor laws and they can pay low wages, when they see we mean business, when they see the USMCA—Senator WYDEN and I took an agreement that was another corporate trade agreement handed down by President Trump and fixed it, so it has these strong labor provisions. When they see that we mean business, that we are going to enforce these labor laws, and that we are going to pass an agreement that works for workers, some companies are going to think twice about shutting down production in Youngstown, Marietta, Toledo, or Dayton and moving overseas. That is part of the goal of this enforcement too.

Mr. WYDEN. If you would, Senator BROWN, take us through what kinds of actions can be taken against a facility. In other words, my understanding is, if the labor inspectors find violations when they inspect it, they have a host of remedies. The gentleman touched on this in the committee, but what kinds of actions can be taken against that particular facility?

Mr. BROWN. First let me talk for a second about a sector that is very important in my part of the country: the auto sector. If a company cheats in an auto facility in a Mexican community and we find labor violations and we take action against that company, the action is not against just that company's facility in that community. If a company cheats its workers and has broken the law on any number of labor violations, that applies to any product that company ultimately sends in from any one of its factories in Mexico. It addresses sort of the Whac-A-Mole kind of attempts companies might have: Well, they cheat there, but they bring in products from somewhere else.

We look at that in a pretty broad way. Fundamentally, it works this

way: If we find a violation, first, there is a fine, and the fine is essentially proportionate to the violation, meaning that it is not as punitive. The first offense is not especially punitive. The second and the third offense get more serious. For the second offense, the fine is much greater—beyond proportionality, if you will. The third offense is when we step in and deny them NAFTA benefits, deny them access to our markets, and deny them the breaks they get under NAFTA at the border on the tariffs. So if it is a violation of labor law, by the third violation, the enforcement and the penalties are such that the companies are going to quit doing it.

I mean, that is the whole point. I don't want to levy these fines. I want companies to obey the labor law that the Mexican Government has passed in their new labor law and that are under the NAFTA agreement.

Mr. WYDEN. So would Senator BROWN be saying that if it is found that there were labor violations at a car factory, the penalties could apply to any car that might come into the United States from that factory throughout the investigation, not just going forward?

Mr. BROWN. Correct, from that factory and also from other factories owned by the same automaker, so that you can't cheat one place and expect to get all your autos into the United States without tariffs.

We thought a lot about this. Over the last 20 years, we looked at what has happened. We looked back over the last couple of decades, working with the very good Democratic staff of the Finance Committee and with our office, and found every possible example we could on how violations occur and how you stop those violations. So we built in a process. It is pretty complicated, and it took a while.

As I said, the President handed down another corporate trade agreement that helps corporations at the expense of workers, and we weren't going to let that happen this time. That is why the Trump USMCA took a long time to pass—because for a whole year, they were resistant to good labor enforcement. They wanted to help their corporate buddies.

Senator WYDEN will remember that there was a provision in there to help the drug companies, a big giveaway to the drug companies. We said no to that. Speaker PELOSI said no to that. We stripped that out of the agreement. We wanted this agreement to center on workers—not to help the drug companies, not to help Wall Street, not to help and encourage those companies that outsource jobs.

Mr. WYDEN. I have appreciated this colloquy with Senator BROWN.

I have a couple of town meetings at home this weekend, working-class neighborhoods, where trade has been really important. One out of four jobs in my State revolves around trade, and those jobs often pay better than do the nontrade jobs. If anybody says ''Well, Ron, do you think anything is really going to be accomplished with what you and Senator BROWN are talking about?'' I am going to say that I went through the entire enforcement process in terms of the key provisions, and we laid out for the country and the Senate that you have led an effort to speed up by more than 300 percent the timeline for an enforcement action. I mean, it used to take years and years sometimes. You have shortened that by literally more than 300 percent. You have been part of an effort that is tougher because you can go after the individual factories.

Then, finally, I think this enforcement proposal gets to the heart of what we need to be doing because it means if you rip off workers, we are going to stop products those workers have produced at the border.

My guess is, there will be a lot more discussion. I see we have another valuable colleague from the Finance Committee who has been heavily involved in these issues for a lot of years. But I want to say again that this didn't happen by osmosis, because when we got that flawed bill, I think everybody said: Well, they will probably have some discussions about it, and that will be pretty much it.

Mr. BROWN. I saw this when Senator WYDEN and I announced the success of getting Brown-Wyden into the bill. I heard from a lot of—shall we say—pro-Trump, pro-corporate lawmakers in this body, mostly on that side of the aisle but all over. They were pretty angry because they thought this was going to be another trade agreement—USMCA was going to be another trade agreement written by corporations, mostly written in secret, that will serve corporate interests, that will pad the bottom line, that will help million-dollar-a-year executives make multimillion dollars a year, that will help their major stockholders and will ignore workers.

They were fine with that because that is too often what this body does. They found that—oh, my gosh—this trade agreement actually puts workers at the center. That was, I know, your goal and my goal. That is why people at your town meetings in Eugene and Portland and Bend and all over Oregon are going to hear from you about how this will help the middle class, fundamentally.

I appreciate the time.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I think this has been central to what we will be debating and we will be voting on tomorrow morning.

I want to thank Senator BROWN. This bill would not have happened without tough trade enforcement led by Senator BROWN. This bill would not have happened, period, full stop.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, before the senior Democrat, the ranking member of the Finance Committee, leaves the floor and before the Senator, my colleague from Ohio, leaves the floor, I want to thank them both. We would not be here on this day without them and without their leadership—both of them.

When SHERROD BROWN says that he has never met a trade agreement he wanted to even think about supporting—thank you for making this one that virtually all of us can support. My highest regards.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Madam President, I have a speech here that starts off with ''Mr. President'' over and over again, but I am going to say ''Madam President.'' I rise today to discuss the new treaty to replace the North American Free Trade Agreement, affectionately known as NAFTA.

Last week, those of us who serve on the Finance Committee had an opportunity to evaluate the new NAFTA. In fact, about a half dozen or so committees have been given different jurisdictions to do that, with respect to this trade agreement.

As you know, trade deals are often dense agreements that have hundreds of provisions relating to any number of issues. Ultimately, trade agreements and trade legislation move through the Senate Finance Committee. We just heard from two of our senior members.

As another senior member of that committee for many years now, I have considered many trade bills and looked at what impact those bills would have on American consumers, producers, manufacturers, farmers, and businesses—citizens. After all, our economy depends on making sure that other countries can sell to us and that we can sell to other countries, especially close allies like Canada to our north and Mexico to our south.

Following years of uncertainty, thanks to the President's haphazard trade wars, I believe this agreement will provide a measure of certainty for those who help drive our economy. Provisions included in the new NAFTA will help in our State, on the Delmarva Peninsula, our poultry producers gain better access to Canadian markets. It is not just important to Delaware; it is important to Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and other places where they raise chickens.

Further, the new trade deal increases market access for dairy farmers in Delaware, and those across the country, to sell their milk products—products like powdered milk—to Canada. The International Trade Commission estimates that this will allow for an additional $315 million in exports annually. That is a $315 million increase in exports just under the milk side, the dairy side, in sales to Canada every year.

When we evaluate the new NAFTA as what it is—a trade deal—I believe that it makes significant improvements on past trade agreements, including the

original NAFTA. New NAFTA adds stronger language to ensure that the obligations to all three counties under multilateral environmental agreements, including the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol, can be fully enforced. I will come back and talk more about that in a short while.

Thanks primarily to Democrats, though, it is no longer the case that the failure of one NAFTA country to ratify an environmental agreement can be used to prevent the others from being held accountable for failing to honor their obligations. New NAFTA also includes new provisions that have never been included in trade agreements before.

Environmental violations will now be treated as trade violations, so when the United States does bring cases under the new NAFTA's environmental obligations, those cases will be easier to win going forward.

This agreement also includes significant new wins for coastal States, including binding provisions around overfishing, around conservation of marine species, and marine debris. When we talk about marine debris, just keep this in mind: There is, floating out in the oceans of the world, something called the Great Pacific Garbage Patch. It is largely plastics. It is twice the size of Texas—not twice the size of Delaware, not twice the size of Maryland; it is twice the size of Texas.

In addition to the $88 million for environmental monitoring, cooperation and enforcement, the new NAFTA creates an enforcement mechanism that gives environmental stakeholders an expanded role in enforcement matters. This will go a long way toward ensuring that environmental violations can be investigated and remedied in a substantive and timely manner.

My colleagues have heard me say before that I have a friend who, when you ask him how he is doing, he replies: Compared to what?

Well, compared to all the previous trade agreements that this body has considered, new NAFTA and its implementing legislation have the strongest environmental enforcement provisions we have seen to date, period. That is good news, especially for a trade deal put forth under this administration.

Does the new NAFTA include everything that my Democratic colleagues and I—and some Republican colleagues—would have liked to see with regard to environmental protection? No, it does not.

This new NAFTA fails to recommit the United States, for example, to the Paris accord. It fails to ratify the Kigali amendment that I mentioned earlier to the Montreal protocol, which could bring the global community together to reduce the use of something called HFCs, hydrofluorocarbons, found in products like air conditioners and freezers, and prevent, by the use of those follow-on products to HFCs, up to a half-degree Celsius increase in global warming by the end of this century, just for doing this one thing—one thing.

Like so many of the Trump administration's proposals, the new NAFTA fails to even mention the words ''climate change.'' This trade agreement does add important tools and resources that were primarily negotiated by Democrats to strengthen the deal, hold the administration accountable to enforce NAFTA countries' obligations, and help ensure that those who break the rules are actually held accountable.

As the senior top Democrat on the Environment and Public Works Committee in the Senate, I am especially aware of the extreme and destructive environmental policies put forth by the current administration.

Week after week, I have helped to lead the fight against some reckless rollbacks, too many unbelievably unqualified candidates, and their relentless attempts to chip away at our Nation's bedrock environmental protections. We know what to expect from this administration when it comes to environmental policies.

As a result, I know that the environmental provisions in new NAFTA—thanks to the hard work from Democrats in both the House and the Senate, and some Republicans too—are far stronger than where we started. It is certainly not perfect, and we can, and we must, do more going forward. But it is better than we have ever done before, and that must be recognized.

I want to pause for a moment to thank Ambassador Robert Lighthizer and his staff—the Trade Ambassador, Trade Rep's office—for their hard work and their willingness to engage with my colleagues and with me. It has been an extraordinary outreach, great responsiveness. I just want to say thank you to the Ambassador and to his team. It reminds me of what we had with Michael Froman when he was the Trade Rep in the last administration.

Let me end it with this, if I could: While it is good news that we were able to reach an agreement on the new NAFTA, I want to caution my colleagues that the uncertainty caused by President Trump's haphazard approach to trade is far from over. President Trump's multifront trade war with our allies and our trading partners is approaching 2 years now. That is 2 years of American farmers, American manufacturers, retailers, and small businesses experiencing increased costs from President Trump's tariffs while simultaneously being locked out of overseas markets due to retaliatory tariffs.

That is 2 years of uncertainty and disruption for American business that have had to put investments and hiring decisions on hold and 2 years of uncertainty for the American workers who are not sure if their jobs will continue to exist as trade wars drag on.

Where has that gotten us? A limited trade agreement with Japan, which may be better than nothing, but it is largely an attempt to cover up some of the negative effects that withdrawal from the transpacific trade partnership, TPP, has had on our economy and our global competitors.

For those who don't remember, TPP, Trans-Pacific Partnership, as you will recall, negotiated in the last administration, was a 12-nation trading bloc, negotiated primarily by the U.S. Trade Representative, Michael Froman, and his staff. That included 40 percent of the world's economy in one trading bloc, 12 nations. Guess who led it: We did. Guess who was excluded: China, for the bad behavior they sometimes follow. On the outside, they were looking in. And somehow we walked away from that. What we have come up with in its place is something that is, in my view, not nearly as bold and, unfortunately, not the path we have taken.

I am still reviewing the text of the ''phase one''—I will put that in quotes—China trade deal that was signed, I think, today. But from what I have seen, the agreement falls far short of the structural reforms to China's planned economy that President Trump has ''trumpeted'' for some time. As best as I can tell, the structural reforms in China's economy did not make the final cut.

As we enter this new year and a new decade, I sincerely hope our President will rethink what many believe are senseless approaches to trade and return to a multilateral approach—much as we had on the Trans-Pacific Partnership—where the United States works with our allies and trading partners to constructively write the global rules of trade.

With that, I see one of my colleagues, also from Ohio, rising to address a welcoming audience.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I appreciate my colleague from Delaware and his comments on trade.

I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Ohio, SHERROD BROWN, be permitted to address the Chamber for a brief tribute following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PORTMAN. I am on the floor today to talk about international trade. What a week it has been. In the same few days, we are seeing the culmination of nearly 3 years of effort by this administration to deliver wins for American workers, for businesses, for farmers, and for consumers with regard to our three biggest trading partners, China, Canada, and Mexico.

This is a big week. While the media is focused on impeachment—and I can say that because as I walked in that is all the reporters wanted to talk about—here we are on the floor talking about something that directly affects the constituents we represent. I think it is very positive in all three areas—China, Canada, and Mexico. In a way, it is like

the World Series and the Super Bowl of trade all in the same week because these are big agreements that make a big difference.

The U.S.-Mexico agreement is being finalized, and it will be voted on tomorrow.

Second today is the signing of phase one of the China agreement, something many of us have been focused on over the past few years and wondered whether we would get here, and here we are.

As a former trade lawyer and as a former U.S. Trade Representative under George W. Bush and as someone on the Trade Committee, which is the Finance Committee here, I follow these issues closely. Most significantly, I come from Ohio, which is a State that depends on trade and depends on that trade being fair to our workers, our farmers, our service providers, and our small businesses. We have a lot of manufacturing and a lot of agriculture. In fact, 25 percent of our State's factory workers have export jobs. One out of every three acres planted in Ohio is planted for export. Think about that. When you drive through our beautiful State and you see the corn and the soybeans out there in the field, one out of every three acres is being planted to be exported somewhere else. That is great for our farmers. It gives them markets, and it raises prices for their product at a time when they really need it. By the way, these trade jobs are good jobs too. Jobs dependent on trade pay, on average, about 16 percent more than other jobs, and they have better benefits. We like to be able to send more to the rest of the world.

We have about 5 percent of the world's population in this country. We have to be sure that with 25 percent of the world's economy here and 5 percent of the people, that we are selling stuff overseas to the other 95 percent. It is always in our interest to open up overseas markets for our workers, our farmers, our services, and our service providers. While promoting those exports, we need to ensure that we are protecting American jobs from unfair trade and from imports that would unfairly undercut our workers and our farmers.

Simply put, we want a level playing field. With that level playing field, where you get fair and reciprocal treatment from other countries, we will do just fine.

American workers and businesses can compete, and they can win if it is fair. That is all we are asking for. To me, the sweet spot is balanced trade, where we are able to send our exports overseas without high tariffs and other barriers, and we are able to see imports coming in fairly traded into the United States. If we do that, we will be fine.

The good thing about this week is that both of these agreements—the new USMCA, which replaces NAFTA, and this phase one of the China agreement—are exactly focused on how to have balanced trade. At times, recently, other countries have been wondering whether the United States was going to make progress on trade, to be frank, so this week is also important because the world is watching. What the world is seeing is that we can fulfill our stated interest in renegotiating and improving trade agreements and trade relationships.

Concluding these two agreements proves that the United States can get to ''yes'' on these very big issues. We are able to work through our partisan differences here at home. We just saw this on the floor this afternoon where Democrats and Republicans alike are talking about their support for USMCA. In tough negotiations with our trading partners—we had some tough negotiations with Canada, Mexico, and China—we can reach outcomes that benefit our country and help to create that more effective balance for American workers.

There is, perhaps, no better example of this balance than USMCA. Without it, by the way, we go back to the status quo, which would be NAFTA. That is a 25-year-old agreement that had to be updated. It just doesn't reflect the realities of a modern economy. Thanks to important measures designed to strengthen our economy, create jobs, and increase market access for American exports, this new USMCA will help level that playing field we talked about.

First of all, USMCA means American jobs and economic growth. The independent International Trade Commission has studied it. They have said this new agreement will create at least 176,000 new jobs and will grow our economy. It also says that with regard to the auto industry, it will create tens of thousands of jobs. That is, again, very important to Ohio. We are a big State for auto production. These jobs are going to mean a lot to workers in my State.

Part of the way it is going to create jobs is by leveling the playing field with enforceable labor standards. We just heard about this from the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Ohio, about how this agreement has new enforceable standards with regard to labor.

It also, though, has higher content requirements for U.S.-made steel and auto parts. This is important. I will give you an example. USMCA requires that 70 percent of the steel and 75 percent of overall content in USMCA-compliant vehicles come from USMCA countries. In other words, other countries can't come in and take advantage of the lower tariffs that we are providing under USMCA by adding too much to the content of those vehicles. The 75-percent overall content requirement is up from 62.5 percent in NAFTA. That makes that 75 percent the highest percentage of any trade agreement we have. It means more jobs in the United States, in particular, and fewer imports from countries like China, countries like Germany, countries like Japan that otherwise would come in and take advantage of this.

Some have criticized these content provisions as being somehow protectionist. I disagree. We are saying to these countries that if you want freer trade with us, enter into a trade agreement, lower your barriers, and give us access to your markets as we are giving Mexico and Canada access to our markets. That is what a trade agreement is all about. If you don't want to do that, you shouldn't be able to free ride on our USMCA. I think this makes sense. Why should Japan or China or Germany be a free rider on our agreement with Canada and Mexico?

This will incentivize good jobs in America, but it also incentivizes these other countries to enter into trade agreements with us. They can see that if you do an agreement with the United States, it is balanced and fair. You will have some benefit as well. The International Trade Commission expects that USMC will grow our economy by double the gross domestic product of that projected to be increased under what is called the Trans-Pacific Partnership. I tell you that because TPP, Trans-Pacific Partnership, is one that Members on the other side of the aisle have talked about as being such a great agreement. This grows the economy by more than double based on the ITPF estimate. Again, this is a big deal.

USMCA also means important new rules of the road for online sales. So much of our commerce today takes place over the internet, but there is nothing to protect it or promote it in NAFTA. Because it was done 25 years ago when there was hardly any internet business, it doesn't have any protection.

This USMCA was written to fix that. It does. It prohibits data localization requirements by banning tariffs on data online and by raising the de minimis level on customs duties for sales to Mexico and Canada. This means they can't require the servers to be in Canada or Mexico, as an example, for our digital economy here in the United States, which is one of our great advantages. For a lot of small companies in Ohio and around the country and for startups that do business online and rely on smaller shipments, this is very important. The relief from the customs burdens and also the data localization requirements and the inability for other countries to put tariffs on data is really important. This is great for us as a country.

The third thing I want to mention is that American farmers are going to see unprecedented levels of access to new markets in Canada and Mexico under USMCA. Between bad weather, low prices even going into the bad weather, and the tariffs that were in place to get to this agreement with China, in particular, farmers have been hit pretty hard. So this is the light at the end of the tunnel. This gives them a chance, under USMCA, to get some new markets. That is why nearly 1,000 farm

groups around the country have announced publicly that they strongly support this agreement.

A lot of politicians and pundits have their views on who won the negotiations over USMCA that we will vote on here tomorrow on the floor. You can go back and forth on that, but in my view, thanks to the hard work of U.S. Trade Representative Robert Lighthizer and thanks to President Trump pushing on this, the winner here is the American people. That is who I think benefits the most. They are going to benefit from a new, more modernized trade agreement that will replace an agreement that has shown its age with unenforceable labor and environmental standards, nonexistent digital economy provisions, and outdated rules of origin provisions that allow more automobiles and more auto parts to be manufactured overseas rather than being manufactured here in the United States.

I think the American people benefit. We all benefit. I am glad we are going to finally have a chance to vote on this landmark trade agreement. I urge that tomorrow we pass it on a bipartisan basis, and I think we will. Getting this to the finish line is a significant achievement but to also do it signing onto the phase one agreement with China today is really incredible.

Again, it has been a strong week. I want to congratulate Bob Lighthizer, the Trade Rep, President Trump, and others who worked to bring this win to the finish line.

When I was U.S. Trade Rep for George W. Bush, we conducted the first-ever economic relationship review with China. We issued a report, and it concluded that our trade relationship with China lacked equity, durability, and balance. Well, 13 years later, China still doesn't play by the rules. So much of that continues. One reason the trade deficit with China is going to be the largest in the world is because of that. In 2018, we sent China about $180 billion in exports, and they sent us about $560 billion in exports. That means we had a resulting trade deficit of about $380 billion—the biggest trade deficit in the history of the world. That is a problem, but it is more than just the trade deficit. That isn't the only way to measure trade.

Beijing routinely uses subsidies, state-owned enterprises, and a lack of transparency by government control on their own economy in order to surpass the United States as the world's economic and innovation leader. China's current policies undercut critical commitments China made, both to the WTO, the World Trade Organization, and to us and other countries—agreements that they would open up their market, protect intellectual property rights, adhere to international recognized labor rights, and meet its WTO commitments on unfair trade practices such as subsidies, which they provide.

I encourage you to read the U.S. Trade Representative's section 301 report on China. That is its basis for this phase one agreement and the basis for the administration putting those higher tariffs in place on Chinese products over the past couple of years. The report notes that in 2016, the multilateral Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, OECD, ranked China the fourth most restrictive investment climate in the world, despite them being the second largest economy in the world. Based on this OECD report, China's investment climate is nearly four times more restrictive than that of the United States. That is why we needed to take some action and have a negotiation with China to come up with something that was mutually beneficial.

I have supported these 301 actions by President Trump to create this more level playing field for American workers, farmers, and business owners. The only significant leverage we had to be able to do that, by the way, was by controlling access to our own market by raising tariffs. Higher tariffs had collateral consequences, and we have seen that for our consumers and other countries. They have been a necessary evil to hold China's feet to the fire and force them to the negotiating table and to get the result we have seen today.

These tough measures are now paying off. Think about it in terms of what I said before—equity, durability, and balance. In the interests of a more balanced relationship, phase one directly addresses that $380 billion trade deficit we talked about. China has agreed to increase its purchases of American products by at least $200 billion over the next 2 years, with additional increases likely in the future. That is going to help reduce our trade deficit and provide some relief, particularly in the agricultural, manufacturing, and energy sectors.

The agreement includes provisions to make our relationship more equitable. That includes new commitments on intellectual property protection, new obligations on tech transfer, and a discipline on currency manipulation, similar to that which is in the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement. Specifically, Beijing committed to eliminate pressure on U.S. companies to transfer their intellectual property to Chinese firms as a condition of doing business in China. This is a big deal, and it is a critical step in addressing the IP theft China has used to fuel its economic rise. Chinese companies aren't forced to hand over their patents as a condition of doing business here in America and American companies shouldn't be forced to do the same in China.

We will also be able to keep a closer eye on China's currency manipulation. When the Treasury Department found evidence of manipulation to boost Chinese exports, they labeled Chinese a currency manipulator for the first time since 1994. That designation was just lifted because of phase 1. This new agreement contains new transparency and accountability commitments to ensure that American trade enforcers can better monitor future manipulation.

The phase 1 agreement is a first good step toward creating a more balanced and equitable relationship between our two countries, but our trade relationship will remain durable only if we enforce these agreements. That is why it is also very significant that this agreement includes the option to reimpose tariffs should China fail to live up to the commitments it has made.

Enforcement is critical. Just as the rest of the world is watching our success at getting to ''yes'' on these trade agreements, it is also watching how aggressively we are going to enforce these commitments. That is why it is imperative that the United States utilize this enforcement process assertively and swiftly should we find evidence that China has violated its commitments. Congress is watching.

With such a big day for trade, especially only a couple of weeks into the new year, it would be easy to ask if anything else is left for the rest of the year. My answer is, yes, there is a lot. We should celebrate our accomplishments tonight, but tomorrow continues to bring a host of challenges and opportunities to advance a bold trade agenda.

Most importantly, the next step is to negotiate the phase 2 agreement with China that will address the additional structural issues I mentioned earlier—the subsidies, the state-owned enterprises, and the lack of transparency—that make doing business in China an uphill battle. Resolving these issues will be critical to ensuring that our two economies are playing by the same set of rules, not different sets of rules.

Between the USMCA and this phase 1 agreement, 2020 has already been a significant year for trade, but there is even more progress we are set to make. I look forward to phase 2 negotiations with Japan this spring, especially regarding new market access for ''Made in America'' automobiles. I look forward to potential FTA talks with Switzerland and with the United Kingdom post-Brexit—new trade agreements to open up more market access. We also want to ensure that the extension of the WTO moratorium of tariffs on data continues, and I hope we will see renewed efforts at WTO reform. We need to address America's longstanding fundamental concerns about the appellate body, special and differential status, and the decline of the WTO's negotiating function. We have lots to do.

I hope Congress will consider new legislation to toughen our anti-dumping and countervailing duty laws this year to crack down on trade cheats, and I hope we will pass the Trade Security Act to return section 232 to its original purpose of protecting genuine national security threats.

Clearly, there is a lot of work we can do in 2020, and I look forward to it. Yet we should pause today and congratulate the Trump administration on these two successes we have talked

about. I have long advocated for balanced trade that prioritizes market opening and tough enforcement, and I believe that both the USMCA and the China agreement embody this philosophy of balanced trade. Most importantly, I believe our country is better off because of it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio.

REMEMBERING CHRIS ALLEN

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise to honor a dedicated public servant whom we tragically lost last week, Chris Allen.

Chris served in the Senate for nearly a decade, most recently on Senator GRASSLEY's staff. I appreciate that Senator GRASSLEY happens to be presiding right now as the President pro tem of the Senate. Chris was a leader in our efforts to solve the pension crisis that threatens the retirement security of more than a million Americans, including a number of people in the Galleries today.

My staff and I got to know him well while working together to find a bipartisan solution. He was part of what we consider to be a sort of pensions family in the Senate. We didn't always agree, but Chris always understood the stakes. He took this crisis seriously. He knew it affected people's lives in the most central way. He understood what collective bargaining was about—meaning, you give money up today in wages to protect your future. He was committed to finding a solution. Most importantly, as Senator GRASSLEY knows, he always treated the retirees with dignity, and he respected their work. He understood what this retirement crisis meant to those families and the pressures they were under.

In 2018, when we worked together with him and Senator GRASSLEY's staff and Chairman Hatch and Senator PORTMAN on our bipartisan pensions committee, we held a field hearing in Columbus in order to hear directly from current workers, retirees, and small businesses. Chris came to Ohio for the entire field hearing. He didn't have to, and a lot of staff members didn't. Yet he understood how important it was to talk to the people whose livelihoods were at stake in this crisis.

Workers and retirees came from all over Ohio. Companies that had often been in business for 100 years came from all over the region for that hearing. We had a 25,000-person rally outside the Ohio State Capitol. I would add again that a number of people in the Galleries today were at that rally. Our staff was a little nervous about how Chris might react when he saw that, for his boss had had some disagreements with these folks in the best way to find a solution. Yet Chris just looked at that sea of people and said: ''That's cool.''

That empathy was a part of who he was. He was responsive. He was kind and thoughtful. He embodied the decorum of what the Senate should be. He wasn't interested in partisan warfare. At a time when too many people retreat to their partisan corners, that was not Chris Allen. That spirit of cooperation and of mutual respect will be missed more than ever. He was dedicated to his work. He was dedicated to the people whom our work affects.

He would meet for hours and do whatever it took to work toward a solution. The only thing he stopped for was his family. Chris was a devoted father to his two daughters, Lucie and Sophie. Connie's and my hearts go out to them and to Lynda, Chris' wife. I know nothing we can say could erase the pain of the sudden death of a father and a husband so young. I hope they take some comfort in knowing how many lives, starting with Senator GRASSLEY's, Chris touched. We miss him. We will continue to fight for a bipartisan solution that honors Chris' memory and protects the pensions that American workers have earned over a lifetime of work.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington State.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for mentioning and honoring Chris Allen, and our sympathies to the Grassley family. Thank you so much for talking about the hard work that so many of our staff do around the Capitol that people don't realize. While we have lost some on our side, too, it is important to remember those who give so much of their time and energy to make our country better.

H.R. 5430

Mr. President, I rise to support the US-Mexico-Canada Agreement we are going to be voting on tomorrow, and I want to thank all the people who worked on it, including Senator GRASSLEY, Senator WYDEN, Senator BROWN, Speaker PELOSI, and many other people to get us a final product that I think we all believe should move forward.

It is very important to me, coming from one of the most trade-dependent States, that we continue to open up trade markets, but I hope my colleagues will also realize that the world economy has reached a tipping point. Over half of the world is now either middle class or wealthier. So that means that we have more people to sell more U.S. products to. That means bigger market opportunities for U.S. manufactured goods, for agriculture products, and a way for us to continue to compete in some of our most important industries. That is why I have always supported making sure that we continue to open up trade markets in a fair way. And for us in Washington State, the North American Free Trade Agreement was a positive move. In the context, prior to the NAFTA agreement for Washington, in Mexico, there was $300 million of Washington exports. Now there is more than $2 billion, and they are our largest export market for Washington apples.

Today, Canada, you can see a similar story. Prior to the North American Free Trade Agreement, our products into that country were roughly about $2 billion; today, they are more than $9 billion. So continuing to modernize the North American Free Trade Agreement is an important step for Washington and for our economy. The important aspects of this deal help us open and get a fair playing field for wheat, for making sure that digital trade continues in a fair way, and that dairy products are accessed into Canada in a fair way and that our wine industry—believe it or not, Canadians drink a lot of wine, particularly in British Columbia, and they have not always given us fair access to that market. So it is very important that it will increase access to Washington wines into Canada, which is the largest market for Washington wines, buying about $10 million in exports a year. But as I mentioned, USMCA will maintain a duty-free access for our dairy products to Mexico; it will certainly make sure that our wheat products are on a level playing field and continue the access to digital trade.

I want to thank my colleagues Senator BROWN and Senator WYDEN and Speaker PELOSI and all those in the labor movement who worked hard with getting an enforcement and capacity-building provision in this legislation. But what we are doing here that I know of for the first time is business and labor coming together and saying ''we need to build the capacity within a country so that they can enforce trade agreements.'' This is a positive step, not just for Mexico, but a positive step for what we need to do around the globe. I wish we could just say to every country, ''Yes, put up the regime to enforce these laws, and make it happen tomorrow, and we can help you and your economy.'' But it just doesn't work like that. And when you retreat from trade—and, trust me, I believe this administration has retreated from trade when it starts with a tariff-first approach. You cannot start the discussion with throwing out tariffs and then penalizing our farmers and then thinking that we are going to get the door open. So I am all ears to hear how we are going to get a real agreement with China.

But I thank my colleagues who did the hard work on this USMCA agreement to make enforcement and capacity building real for the first time. Why? Because as we look at that world economy outside the United States, it is one of the biggest economic opportunities we will see. That is, we know how to grow things. We know how to make things. We should make sure we are opening up markets in a fair trade regime to those products. So I will continue to work with our colleagues here to make sure that that is achieved. I hope the President will stop the tariff-first approach, stop the continuation of the tariffs and the impacts that we are seeing now, and get down to continuing to negotiations with our being a leader for opening up markets.

The United States can't lose shelf space to very, very competitive markets and then come back years later and try to regain it. Let's be a world leader in establishing the rules for fair trade and pushing for provisions like we see in the USMCA agreement so we can move forward, making sure Washington products, U.S. Products, American-made products, get delivered to a growing, wealthier world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHINA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the NAFTA 2.0 trade agreement negotiated by President Trump.

This agreement is opposed by labor unions like the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, as well as by the United Food and Commercial Workers International Union. It is opposed by numerous environmental organizations, including the Sunrise Movement, the Sierra Club, Friends of the Earth, the League of Conservation Voters, and virtually every major environmental organization in the country. Further, it is opposed by the National Family Farm Coalition, which believes it will lock in rules that have devastated family-based agriculture and expand corporate control over agriculture in North America.

I am proud to stand with these labor unions, with the environmental groups, and family farmers against President Trump's NAFTA 2.0.

I not only voted against NAFTA in 1993, but I marched against it. In 2000 I voted against permanent normal trade relations with China. I opposed the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement and other trade agreements.

The bottom line is that we need trade agreements in this country that work for workers, that work for farmers, and not just the CEOs of large multinational corporations.

There is no doubt in my mind that we need to fundamentally rewrite our disastrous trade agreements and create and protect good-paying American jobs, and that we need trade agreements that will improve the environment and combat climate change, and we need trade agreements that end the destructive race to the bottom, where workers are forced to work for lower, lower wages.

Unfortunately, this revised trade agreement with Mexico and Canada does none of these things. It must be rewritten.

While NAFTA has led to the loss of nearly 1 million American jobs, this agreement does virtually nothing to stop the outsourcing of jobs to Mexico. Under this agreement, large multinational corporations will still be able to shut down factories in America, where workers are paid some $28 an hour, and move to Mexico, where workers there are paid less than $2 an hour.

When Donald Trump was a candidate for President, he promised that he would stop the outsourcing of American jobs to Mexico, China, and other low-wage countries. That has not happened.

The truth is, since Trump took office, over 170,000 American jobs have been shipped overseas. In 2018, we had a recordbreaking $891 billion trade deficit in goods, a $419 billion trade deficit with China, and an $81 billion trade deficit with Mexico.

In 2018, for the first time in our history, manufacturing workers began getting paid less than workers overall. It used to be that manufacturing workers made really good wages compared to the rest of the workforce. It is not the case anymore.

Today, manufacturing workers get $28.15 an hour, while the average worker makes 15 cents an hour more. Last month we lost 12,000 factory jobs, and despite Trump's rhetoric, we are in a manufacturing recession.

There is a reason why virtually every major environmental group is opposed to Trump's NAFTA 2.0. This agreement does nothing to stop fossil fuel companies like ExxonMobil and Chevron from dumping their waste and pollution into Mexico and destroying the environment. In fact, it makes it easier for fossil fuel companies to bring tar sands oil into the United States through dangerous pipelines like the Keystone XL.

This proposal does not even mention the word ''climate change.'' Imagine in the year 2020 that we have a major trade agreement that does not even mention the words ''climate change,'' the existential threat facing not only our country but the entire planet.

This deal preserves the disastrous investor-state dispute settlement system for oil and gas companies, allowing them to continue to put corporate profits ahead of our air, water, climate, and health.

At this pivotal moment in American history, it is not good enough to tinker around the edges. The scientific community has been very clear. If we do not act boldly and aggressively to transform our energy system away from fossil fuel and into energy efficiency and sustainable energy, the future of this planet is in doubt, and there is no question but that the Nation and planet we leave to our children and to our grandchildren will be increasingly unhealthy and uninhabitable.

We have a major climate crisis and no trade deal should be passed that does not address that issue.

In my view, we need to rewrite this trade agreement to stop the outsourcing of American jobs, to combat climate change, to protect the environment, and to stop the destructive race to the bottom.

We have to stop large, profitable corporations that are outsourcing American jobs overseas from receiving lucrative Federal contracts. It makes no sense to me that you have large corporations shut down in America, go to cheap labor countries abroad, and then they get online and receive very large Federal contacts. We have to stop that.

Further, we have to repeal Trump's tax giveaways to the wealthy, which have provided huge tax breaks to companies that shut down manufacturing plants in the United States and move abroad.

Trade is a good thing done well, but this trade agreement does not accomplish that end.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—APPOINTING AND AUTHORIZING MANAGERS FOR THE IMPEACHMENT TRIAL OF DONALD JOHN TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

A message from the House of Representatives by Ms. JOHNSON, Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, announced that the House of Representatives had passed a resolution (H. Res. 798) appointing and authorizing managers for the impeachment trial of Donald John Trump, President of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The message will be received.

The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENTS—RELATING TO ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT AGAINST DONALD JOHN TRUMP

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that pursuant to rule I of the Rules of Procedure and Practice When Sitting on Impeachment Trials, the Secretary of the Senate inform the House of Representatives that the Senate is ready to receive the managers appointed by the House for the purpose of exhibiting Articles of Impeachment against Donald John Trump, President of the United States, agreeably to the notice communicated to the Senate; further, that at the hour of 12 noon on Thursday, January 16, 2020, the Senate will receive the managers on the part of the House of Representatives in order that they may present and exhibit the Articles of Impeachment against Donald John Trump, President of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there any objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that pursuant to rules III and IV of the Rules of Procedure and Practice When Sitting on

Impeachment Trials, that at the hour of 2 p.m. on Thursday, January 16, 2020, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Articles of Impeachment and that the Presiding Officer, through the Secretary of the Senate, notify the Chief Justice of the United States of the time and place fixed for consideration of the articles and request his attendance as Presiding Officer pursuant to article I, section 3, clause 6, of the U.S. Constitution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—AUTHORIZATION FOR APPOINTMENT OF ESCORT COMMITTEE AND HOUSE NOTIFICATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer be authorized to appoint a committee of Senators, two upon the recommendation of the majority leader and two upon the recommendation of the Democratic leader, to escort the Chief Justice into the Senate Chamber. I further ask consent that the Secretary of the Senate be directed to notify the House of Representatives of the time and place fixed for the Senate to proceed upon the impeachment of Donald John Trump in the Senate Chamber.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—SENATE ACCESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that access to the Senate wing, the Senate floor, and the Senate Chamber Galleries during all of the proceedings involving the exhibition of consideration of the Articles of Impeachment against Donald John Trump, President of the United States, and at all times that the Senate is sitting for trial with the Chief Justice of the United States presiding, be in accordance with the allocations and provisions I now send to the desk, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The documents follow:

SECTION 1. SENATE FLOOR ACCESS.

During impeachment proceedings for the President of the United States, the following procedures relating to access to the Senate floor shall apply:

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) ENTRANCE THROUGH CLOAKROOMS.—Individuals with privileges under rule XXIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate (as limited by paragraph (2) of this section), or with privileges under paragraph (3) of this section, shall access the floor of the Senate through the cloakrooms only, unless otherwise directed by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

(B) GENERAL LIMITS ON ACCESS.—Access to the floor of the Senate shall be limited to the number of vacant seats available on the floor of the Senate based on protocol considerations enforced by the Secretary for the Majority, the Secretary for the Minority, and the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

(C) SEATING REQUIREMENTS.—All individuals with access to the floor of the Senate shall remain seated at all times.

(2) LIMITED STAFF ACCESS.—Officers and employees of the Senate, including members of the staffs of committees of the Senate or joint committees of the Congress and employees in the office of a Senator, shall not have privileges under rule XXIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate to access the floor of the Senate, except as needed for official impeachment proceeding duties in accordance with the following:

(A) The Majority Leader and the Minority Leader shall each be limited to not more than 4 assistants.

(B) The Secretary of the Senate and the Assistant Secretary of the Senate shall each have access, and the legislative staff of the Secretary of the Senate shall be permitted as needed under the supervision of the Secretary of the Senate.

(C) The Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate and the Deputy Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper shall each have access, and doorkeepers shall be permitted as needed under the supervision of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

(D) The Secretary for the Majority, the Secretary for the Minority, the Assistant Secretary for the Majority, and the Assistant Secretary for the Minority shall each have access, and cloakroom employees shall be permitted as needed under the supervision of the Secretary for the Majority or the Secretary for the Minority, as appropriate.

(E) The Senate Legal Counsel and the Deputy Senate Legal Counsel shall have access on an as-needed basis.

(F) The Parliamentarian of the Senate and assistants to the Parliamentarian of the Senate shall have access on an as-needed basis.

(G) Counsel for the Secretary of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate shall have access on an as-needed basis.

(H) The minimum number of Senate pages necessary to carry out their duties, as determined by the Secretary for the Majority and the Secretary for the Minority, shall have access.

(3) OTHER INDIVIDUALS WITH SENATE FLOOR ACCESS.—The following individuals shall have privileges of access to the floor of the Senate:

(A) Not more than 3 assistants to the Chief Justice of the United States.

(B) Assistants to the managers of the impeachment of the House of Representatives.

(C) Counsel and assistants to counsel for the President of the United States.

SEC. 2. ACCESS TO THE SENATE WING OF THE CAPITOL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—During impeachment proceedings against the President of the United States, access to the basement and the first, second, and third floors of the Senate Wing of the Capitol shall be limited to—

(1) Senators;

(2) officers and employees of the Senate with appropriate Senate-issued identification cards and appropriate credentials;

(3) employees of the Architect of the Capitol (as necessary and in accordance with subsection (b));

(4) individuals with privileges under rule XXIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate (as limited by section 1(2)) or with privileges under section 1(3);

(5) individuals with official business related to the impeachment proceedings;

(6) members of the press with appropriate credentials;

(7) individuals with special gallery tickets; and

(8) individuals with regular gallery passes to the Senate gallery when the bearer is admitted through tour lines.

(b) ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL.—The Architect of the Capitol shall advise the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate of all officers or employees of the Architect of the Capitol who require access to the Senate Wing of the Capitol during the impeachment proceedings.

SEC. 3. ENFORCEMENT BY THE SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER.

The Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate shall enforce this resolution and take such other actions as necessary to fulfill the responsibilities of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate under this resolution, including the issuance of appropriate credentials as required under paragraphs (2) and (6) of section 2(a).

AUTHORIZING THE TAKING OF A PHOTOGRAPH IN THE CHAMBER OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 471, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 471) authorizing the taking of a photograph in the Chamber of the United States Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 471) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, a few minutes ago, the Senate was notified that the House of Representatives is finally ready to proceed with their Articles of Impeachment. So, by unanimous consent, we have just laid some of the groundwork that will structure the next several days.

We have officially invited the House managers to come to the Senate tomorrow at noon to exhibit their Articles of Impeachment. Then later tomorrow afternoon, at 2 p.m., the Chief Justice of the United States will arrive here in the Senate. He will be sworn in by the President pro tempore, Senator GRASSLEY. Then the Chief Justice will swear in all of us Senators. We will pledge to rise above the petty factionalism and do justice for our institutions, for our States, and for the Nation. Then we will formally notify the

White House of our pending trial and summon the President to answer the articles and send his counsel.

So the trial will commence in earnest on Tuesday.

First, Mr. President, some important good news for the country. We anticipate the Senate will finish the USMCA tomorrow and send this landmark trade deal to President Trump for his signature. This is a major victory for the administration, but more importantly, for American families.

Let me close with this: This is a difficult time for our country, but this is precisely the kind of time for which the Framers created the Senate. I am confident this body can rise above short-termism and factional fever and serve the long-term best interests of our Nation. We can do this, and we must.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all debate time on H.R. 5430 expire at 11 a.m. tomorrow; further, that prior to the expiration of debate time, it be in order for Senator TOOMEY, or his designee, to raise a budget point of order; and that if a point of order is raised, it be in order for Senator GRASSLEY, or his designee, to make a motion to waive the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, this means we will have two rollcall votes tomorrow morning at 11 a.m.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report for January 2020. This is my third scorekeeping report since I filed the deemed budget resolution for fiscal year 2020 on September 9, 2019, as required by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019, BBA19. The report compares current-law levels of spending and revenues with the amounts agreed to in BBA19. In the Senate, this information is used to determine whether budgetary points of order lie against pending legislation. The Republican staff of the Budget Committee and the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, prepared this report pursuant to section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act CBA. The information included in this report is current through January 7, 2020.

Since I filed the last scorekeeping report on December 4, 2019, four measures with significant enforceable budgetary effects have been enacted.

The first measure enacted this reporting period, H.R. 5363, the Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education Act, FUTURE Act, cleared the Senate by voice vote and became P.L. 116–91. The bill included two provisions with significant cost over the 10-year period: a permanent extension of mandatory funding for historically Black colleges and universities and additional mandatory funding for the Pell Grant program. To offset these provisions, the measure allows the Department of Education to access taxpayer data when administering Federal student aid programs. Overall, CBO estimates that the FUTURE Act would reduce outlays by $997 million in the first year, $835 million over 5 years, and $435 million over 10 years. This measure was charged to the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee.

The second measure enacted this reporting period was the conference report to accompany S. 1790, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020. This measure, which became P.L. 116–92 and was charged to the Armed Services Committee, authorized appropriations for the Nation's national defense apparatus for the current fiscal year. In addition to the authorization of funds, the conference report included changes in law, notably to the Survivor Benefit Program, that would affect direct spending and revenues. According to CBO's estimate, the measure would increase direct spending by $5.6 billion over the 2020 to 2029 period.

The third measure, H.R. 1158, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020, became P.L. 116–93. This bill provided funding for fiscal year 2020 programs within the jurisdictions of four Senate appropriations subcommittees, including Defense, Commerce-Justice-Science, Financial Services and General Government, and Homeland Security. CBO estimated that the bill would bring total budget authority provided for programs covered by these four subcommittees to $860.3 billion in fiscal year 2020. Of the amounts provided, $767.6 billion was considered regular appropriations and $92.6 billion qualified for cap adjustments under existing law.

The final measure with significant effects enacted this reporting period was H.R. 1865, the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020. This bill, which became P.L. 116–94, provided appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for the remaining eight Senate appropriations subcommittees, extended numerous expiring programs and tax provisions, repealed several healthcare taxes, expanded access to retirement plans, provided additional resources for pensions for miners, and contained several provisions related to various foreign policy initiatives. CBO estimated that divisions A-H of the bill, which provided discretionary appropriations, would bring total appropriated budget authority for covered programs to $539.9 billion in fiscal year 2020. Of the amount provided, $520.4 billion was provided as regular appropriations and $19.5 billion qualified for cap adjustments under existing law. CBO further estimated that divisions I—Q of the bill would increase deficits by $408.9 billion over the 2020 through 2029 period. Divisions A—H were charged to the Appropriations Committee; divisions I and K were charged to the Banking Committee; division J was charged to the Foreign Relations Committee; division L was charged to the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee; divisions M, N, O, and Q were charged to the Finance Committee; and division P was charged to the Commerce Committee. The measure passed the Senate by a vote of 71 to 23.

Budget Committee Republican staff prepared tables A-D.

Table A gives the amount by which each Senate authorizing committee exceeds or is below its allocation for budget authority and outlays under the fiscal year 2020 deemed budget resolution. This information is used for enforcing committee allocations pursuant to section 302 of the CBA. Legislation enacted to date has resulted in six authorizing committees breaching their allocations provided by BBA19. In total authorizing committees have breached outlay limitations by more than $29.1 billion over the 2020 through 2029 period.

Table B provides the amount by which the Senate Committee on Appropriations is below or exceeds the statutory spending limits. This information is used to determine points of order related to the spending caps found in sections 312 and 314 of the CBA. The table shows that the Appropriations Committee is compliant with spending limits for current the fiscal year. Those limits for regular discretionary spending are $666.5 billion for accounts in the defense category and $621.5 billion for accounts in the nondefense category of spending.

The 2018 budget resolution contained points of order limiting the use of changes in mandatory programs, CHIMPs, in appropriations bills. Table C, which tracks the CHIMP limit of $15 billion for 2020, shows the Appropriations Committee has complied with the CHIMP limit for this fiscal year. CHIMPs enacted as part of the 2020 appropriations cycle include $5.7 billion from changes to the Crime Victims Fund and $9.3 billion in changes to accounts related to the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Table D provides the amount of budget authority enacted for 2020 that has been designated as either for an emergency or for overseas contingency operations pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended. Funding that receives either of these designations results in cap adjustments to enforceable discretionary spending limits. There is no limit on either emergency or overseas contingency operations spending; however, any Senator may challenge the designation with a point of order to strike the designation on the floor. To date, more than $88.0 billion has been enacted with either the emergency or overseas contingency operations designations for the 2020 appropriations cycle.

In addition to the tables provided by Budget Committee Republican staff, I am submitting CBO tables, which I will use to enforce budget totals approved by Congress.

CBO provided a spending and revenue report for 2020, table 1, which helps enforce aggregate spending levels in budget resolutions under CBA section 311. Following the enactment of the two minibus appropriations bills in December and the continued spending of authorizing committees, the current level is now in excess of allowable levels by $15.4 billion for budget authority and $1.7 billion for outlays in 2020. Details on 2020 levels can be found in CBO's second table.

Current-law revenues are currently below enforceable levels for all enforcement periods. Due to the enactment of the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020, and to a lesser extent this year's national defense authorization bill, revenues are currently $34.4 billion, $150.7 billion, and $386.2 billion lower than assumed in the deemed budget resolution for 2020, 2020 through 2024, and 2020 through 2029, respectively. Social Security spending levels are consistent with the budget resolution's figures for 2020; however, Social Security revenue levels are $15 million below assumed levels.

CBO's report also provides information needed to enforce the Senate pay-as-you-go, pay-go, rule table 3. This rule was established under section 4106 of the 2018 budget resolution. The Senate pay-go scorecard currently shows a credit of $965 million in 2020 but deficit increases of $1.1 billion and $5.2 billion over the 2019–2024 and 2019–2029 periods, respectively. Please note that the deficit effects of division I through division Q of the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 are excluded from the Senate's pay-go scorecard pursuant to title X of division I of that law.

This submission also includes a table tracking the Senate's budget enforcement activity on the floor since the enforcement filing on September 9, 2019. I raised two points of order during this reporting period. On December 17, 2019, I raised the long-term deficits point of order against the national defense authorization conference report for increasing deficits by more than $5 billion in years following the current budget window. That point of order was waived by a vote of 82 to 12. On December 19, 2019, I raised the same point of order against the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020, but that was also waived with a vote of 64 to 30.

All years in the accompanying tables are fiscal years.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE A.—SENATE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES—ENACTED DIRECT SPENDING ABOVE (+) OR BELOW (−) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	2020	2020–2024	2020–2029
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Armed Services			
Budget Authority	32	1,972	5,637
Outlays	35	1,972	5,637
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs			
Budget Authority	169	2,260	5,402
Outlays	169	2,246	5,402
Commerce, Science, and Transportation			
Budget Authority	7	7	7
Outlays	7	7	7
Energy and Natural Resources			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Environment and Public Works			
Budget Authority	8,058	38,589	77,069
Outlays	415	683	1,130
Finance			
Budget Authority	8,180	14,359	17,310
Outlays	6,505	14,037	17,340
Foreign Relations			
Budget Authority	2	2	2
Outlays	37	37	37
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Judiciary			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions			
Budget Authority	−720	−400	0
Outlays	−997	−835	−435
Rules and Administration			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Intelligence			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Indian Affairs			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Small Business			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Total			
Budget Authority	15,728	56,789	105,427
Outlays	6,171	18,147	29,118

Note: This table is current through January 7, 2020. This table tracks the spending effects of legislation enacted compared to allowable levels. Each authorizing committee's initial allocation can be found in the Senate Budget Committee Chairman's Congressional Record filing on September 9, 2019.

TABLE B.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS [1]

[Budget authority, in millions of dollars]

	2020	
	Security [2]	Nonsecurity [2]
Statutory Discretionary Limits	666,500	621,500
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	23,493
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	5,695	64,980
Defense	622,522	143
Energy and Water Development	24,250	24,093
Financial Services and General Government	35	23,793
Homeland Security	2,383	48,085
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	35,989
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies	0	183,042
Legislative Branch	0	5,049
Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	11,315	92,171
State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	46,685
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	300	73,977
Current Level Total	666,500	621,500
Total Enacted Above (+) or Below (−) Statutory Limits	0	0

Note: This table is current through January 7, 2020.

[1] This table excludes spending pursuant to adjustments to the discretionary spending limits. These adjustments are allowed for certain purposes in section 251(b)(2) of BBEDCA.

[2] Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.

TABLE C.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)

[Budget authority, millions of dollars]

	2020
CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2020	15,000
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	5,737
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies	9,263
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	15,000
Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (−) Budget Resolution	0

Note: This table is current through January 7, 2020.

TABLE D.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED EMERGENCY AND OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS SPENDING

[Budget authority, millions of dollars]

	Emergency and Overseas Contingency Operations Designated Spending 2020			
	Emergency		Overseas Contingency Operations	
	Security [1]	Nonsecurity [1]	Security [1]	Nonsecurity [1]
Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2019 (P.L. 116–20) [2]	0	8	0	0
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (P.L. 116–93)	1,771	0	70,855	0
Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (P.L. 116–94)	6,229	535	645	8,000
Current Level Total	8,000	543	71,500	8,000

This table is current through January 7, 2020.

[1] Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.

[2] The Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2019 was enacted after the publication of CBO's May 2019 baseline but before the Senate Budget Committee Chairman published the deemed budget resolution for 2020 in the Congressional Record. Pursuant to the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019, the budgetary effects of this legislation have been incorporated into the current level as previously enacted funds.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, January 15, 2020.

Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2020 budget and is current through January 7, 2020. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on September 9, 2019, pursuant to section 204 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019 (Public Law 116–37).

Since our last letter dated December 4, 2020, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following legislation that has significant effects on budget authority and outlays in fiscal year 2020: Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education Act (Public Law 116–91); National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 (Public Law 116–92); Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (Public Law 116–93); and Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (Public Law 116–94).

Sincerely,

PHILLIP L. SWAGEL,
Director.

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020, AS OF JANUARY 7, 2020

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over/ Under (−) Resolution
On-Budget			
Budget Authority	3,816.1	3,831.5	15.4
Outlays	3,733.1	3,734.8	1.7
Revenues	2,740.5	2,706.1	−34.4
Off-Budget			
Social Security Outlays [a]	961.2	961.2	0.0
Social Security Revenues	940.4	940.4	0.0

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
[a] Excludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020, AS OF JANUARY 7, 2020

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted [a] [b]			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,740,538
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,397,769	2,309,887	n.a.
Authorizing and Appropriation legislation	0	595,528	0
Offsetting receipts	−954,573	−954,573	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,443,196	1,950,842	2,740,538
Enacted Legislation			
Authorizing Legislation			
Continuing Appropriations Act, 2020, and Health Extenders Act of 2019 (Div. B, P.L. 116–59)	693	667	0
Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2020, and Further Health Extenders Act of 2019 (Div. B, P.L. 116–69)	8,058	415	0
Women's Suffrage Centennial Commemorative Coin Act (P.L. 116–71)	−2	−2	0
Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education Act (P.L. 116–91)	−720	−997	0
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 (P.L. 116–92)	32	35	1
Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (Div. I–K, M–Q, P.L. 116–94)	8,360	6,720	−34,449
Subtotal, Authorizing Legislation	16,421	6,838	−34,448
Appropriation Legislation [a] [b]			
Continuing Appropriations Act, 2020, and Health Extenders Act of 2019 (Div. A, P.L. 116–59) [c]	0	128	0
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (P.L. 116–93)	884,979	530,980	0
Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (Div. A–H, P.L. 116–94) [d]	1,585,345	1,239,739	0
Subtotal, Appropriation Legislation	2,470,324	1,770,847	0
Total, Enacted Legislation	2,486,745	1,777,685	−34,448
Entitlements and Mandatories	−98,431	6,242	0
Total Current Level [e]	3,831,510	3,734,769	2,706,090
Total Senate Resolution [c]	3,816,122	3,733,075	2,740,538
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	15,388	1,694	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a,	34,448
Memorandum			
Revenues, 2020–2029			
Senate Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	34,461,163
Senate Resolution [e]	n.a.	n.a.	34,847,317
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	386,154

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = public law.
[a] Sections 1001–1004 of the 21st Century Cures Act (P.L. 114–255) require that certain funding provided for 2017 through 2026 to the Department of Health and Human Services—in particular the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health—be excluded from estimates for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Deficit Control Act) and the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Congressional Budget Act). Therefore, the amounts shown in this report do not include $567 million in budget authority and $798 million in estimated outlays.
[b] For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the resolution, as approved by the Senate, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, amounts in this current level report do not include those items.
[c] Section 124 of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2020 (division A of P.L. 116–59), appropriated funding for the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative (within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Defense) and designated those amounts as funding for overseas contingency operations. That provision took effect upon enactment on September 27, 2019.
[d] In consultation with the House and Senate Committees on the Budget and the Office of Management and Budget, rescissions of emergency funding that was not designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not count for certain budgetary enforcement purposes. These amounts, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (Division H, P.L. 116–94)	−7	0	0

[e] Section 204 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019 requires the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget to publish the aggregate spending and revenue levels for fiscal year 2020; those aggregate levels were first published in the Congressional Record on September 9, 2019. The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget has the authority to revise the budgetary aggregates for the budgetary effects of certain revenue and spending measures pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018, as updated by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019.

	Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original Aggregates printed on September 9, 2019	3,703,553	3,680,696	2,740,538
Revisions:			
Adjustment for P.L. 116–59, Continuing Appropriations Act, 2020, and Health Extenders Act of 2019	693	795	0
Adjustment for P.L. 116–69, Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2020, and Further Health Extenders Act of 2019	4,750	4,050	0
Adjustment for P.L. 116–93, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020, and P.L. 116–94, Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020	107,126	47,534	0
Revised Senate Resolution	3,816,122	3,733,075	2,740,538

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD AS OF JANUARY 7, 2020

[In millions of dollars]

	2020	2019–2024	2019–2029
Beginning Balance [a]	0	0	0
Enacted Legislation [b] [c]			
Continuing Appropriations Act, 2020, and Health Extenders Act of 2019 (H.R. 4378, P.L. 116–59) [d]	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Christa McAuliffe Commemorative Coin Act of 2019 (S. 239, P.L. 116–65)	0	0	0
Hidden Figures Congressional Gold Medal Act (H.R. 1396, P.L. 116–68)	*	*	*
Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2020, and Further Health Extenders Act of 2019 (H.R. 3055, P.L. 116–69) [e]	—	—	—

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD AS OF JANUARY 7, 2020—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	2020	2019–2024	2019–2029
Women's Suffrage Centennial Commemorative Coin Act (H.R. 2423, P.L. 116–71)	−2	0	0
Preventing Animal Cruelty and Torture Act (H.R. 724, P.L. 116–72)	*	*	*
Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act of 2019 (S. 1838, P.L. 116–76)	*	*	*
An act to amend section 442 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt certain interests in mutual funds, unit investment trusts, employee benefit plans, and retirement plans from conflict of interest limitations for the Government Publishing Office. (H.R. 5277, P.L. 116–78)	*	*	*
Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education Act (H.R. 5363, P.L. 116–91)	−997	−835	−435
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 (S. 1790, P.L. 116–92)	34	1,975	5,645
Futher Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (H.R. 1865, P.L. 116–94) [f]	—	—	—
Virginia Beach Strong Act (H.R. 4566, P.L. 116–98)	*	*	*
Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation Equitable Compensation Act (S. 216, P.L. 116–100)	*	*	*
Grant Reporting Efficiency and Agreements Transparency Act of 2019 (H.R. 150, P.L. 116–103)	*	*	*
TRACED Act (S. 151, P.L. 116–105)	*	*	*
Impact on Deficit	−965	1,140	5,210
Total Change in Outlays	−965	1,140	5,210
Total Change in Revenues	−964	1,137	5,202
	1	−3	−8

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
n.a = not applicable; P.L. = public law; — = excluded from PAYGO scorecard; * = between −$500,000 and $500,000.
[a] On September 9, 2019, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget reset the Senate's Pay-As-You-Go Scorecard to zero for all fiscal years.
[b] The amounts shown represent the estimated effect of the public laws on the deficit.
[c] Excludes off-budget amounts.
[d] The budgetary effects of division B of this act are excluded from the Senate's PAYGO scorecard, pursuant to sec. 1701(b) of the act. The budgetary effects of division A were fully incorporated into the PAYGO ledger pursuant to the authority provided to the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee in section 3005 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018. The Chairman exercised that authority through filing an adjustment in the Congressional Record on September 26, 2019.
[e] The budgetary effects of division B of this act are excluded from the Senate's PAYGO scorecard, pursuant to sec. 1801(b) of the act.
[f] The budgetary effects of this act are excluded from the Senate's PAYGO scorecard, pursuant to section 1001 of Title X of division I of the act.

ENFORCEMENT REPORT OF POINTS OF ORDER RAISED SINCE THE FY 2020 ENFORCEMENT FILING

Vote	Date	Measure	Violation	Motion to Waive [1]	Result
399	December 17, 2019	Conference Report to Accompany S. 1790, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020.	3101-long-term deficits [2]	Sen Inhofe (R–OK)	82–12, waived
414	December 19, 2019	H.R. 1865, the Further Consolidated Apprioriations Act, 2020	3101-long-term deficits [3]	Sen. Shelby (R–AL)	64–30, waived

[1] All motions to waive were offered pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.
[2] Senator Enzi raised a 3101(b) point of order against the conference report because the legislation would increase on-budget deficits by more than $5 billion in each of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2030.
[3] Senator Enzi raised a 3101(b) point of order against the bill because the legislation would increase on-budget deficits by more than $5 billion in at least one of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2030.

BUDGET ENFORCEMENT LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, BBEDCA, establishes statutory limits on discretionary spending and allows for various adjustments to those limits. In addition, sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 allow the chairman of the Budget Committee to establish and make revisions to allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments.

The Senate will soon consider H.R. 5430, United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act. This measure provides supplemental appropriations to implement the trade agreement that qualify for cap adjustments under current statute.

This measure includes $843 million in budget authority that is designated as being for emergency purposes pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of BBEDCA. The entirety of this budget authority falls within the revised nonsecurity category. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that these appropriations will result in $334 million in outlays in fiscal year 2020.

As a result of the emergency designations, I am revising the budget authority and outlay allocations to the Committee on Appropriations by increasing revised nonsecurity budget authority by $843 million and outlays by $334 million in fiscal year 2020. Further, I am increasing the budgetary aggregate for fiscal year 2020 by equivalent amounts.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables, which provide details about the adjustment, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVISION TO BUDGETARY AGGREGATES

(Pursuant to Sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

$s in millions	2020
Current Spending Aggregates:	
Budget Authority	3,816,122
Outlays	3,733,075
Adjustments:	
Budget Authority	843
Outlays	334
Revised Spending Aggregates:	
Budget Authority	3,816,965
Outlays	3,733,409

REVISION TO SPENDING ALLOCATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

(Pursuant to Sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

$s in millions	2020
Current Allocation:	
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	746,000
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	654,138
General Purpose Outlays	1,416,176
Adjustments:	
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	0
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	843
General Purpose Outlays	334
Revised Allocation:	
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	746,000
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	654,981
General Purpose Outlays	1,416,510

Memorandum: Detail of Adjustments Made Above	OCO	Program Integrity	Disaster Relief	Emergency	Wildfire Suppression	U.S. Census	Total
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	0	0	0	843	0	0	843
General Purpose Outlays	0	0	0	334	0	0	334

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, in addition to my strong and unequivocal support for the USMCA, I note that my committee is about to undertake a yearlong review of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, with the goal of modernizing it.

Back in 1998, the internet was still a fledgling industry, so much so that it is difficult to recall a time when email was a novel form of communication and you could go take a coffee break in

hopes that the web page you wanted would have fully loaded on your computer by the time you returned. It was in this era that the DMCA attempted to strike a reasonable balance between content creators and the operators of online billboards. The DMCA offered immunity to new, emerging platforms in exchange for reasonable enforcement efforts, including quickly taking down copyrighted materials they learned about violations. In 1998, there were no iPhones. There was no Facebook and no YouTube. Netflix opened that year as a mail-order DVD store. For a time, the DMCA worked.

President Trump has led the way to establish a new paradigm for trade agreements that protect American interests, and the USMCA provides for long overdue updates to NAFTA, but the mechanisms of the DMCA to deter copyright infringement need to be updated. Technology has changed faster than anyone could have ever imagined, and the existing DMCA simply isn't able to address these new developments. The original DMCA was simply not designed for the kind of global data and advertising platforms that we have seen develop over time. As is so often the case, the technology has outpaced the law.

I intend to hold a series of hearings this year to explore whether the DMCA needs updating in order to promote the creative economy in the 21st century. This work is critical to North Carolina jobs in the creative sector. For example, the motion picture and television industry is directly responsible for more than 19,000 jobs in North Carolina, representing more than $1 billion in wages in the State. Productions like the series ''Reprisal'' and the upcoming film Uncle Frank were made in North Carolina in 2019. The good, high-wage jobs in the film and television industry, from directors, musicians, and actors, to drivers, makeup artists, painters, and set decorators, are at risk if the products they make lose money due to internet theft.

Without prejudging what changes may be necessary to the DMCA, it is important that our future trade agreements can keep up with the advances of U.S. copyright law. I look forward to working together with my colleagues in the House and Senate and with the White House to ensure we improve the DMCA and create more export opportunities for U.S. businesses and workers in the process. As always, our trade agreements and our copyright law should do all they can to create good incentives and empower market forces to solve problems.

Mr. President, I applaud the inclusion of national treatment language in this agreement, requiring nondiscriminatory treatment of American creators and their goods.

This protects many American goods, of course, but I want to make special note that the inclusion of this provision in USMCA will help undo one particular instance of discrimination/unfair treatment against American creators. It will help ensure that American music creators are fairly compensated when their recordings are played in Canada and Mexico.

Our expectation is that American performers will see an increase in royalty compensation as a result. As it stands today, Canadian artists receive all royalties due under U.S. law for the use of sound recordings here. Those royalties totaled nearly a billion dollars last year for all recordings.

We afford the recordings of all foreign nationals with the same rights due for the recordings of American artists. In Canada, however, royalties collected for radio airplay and other nondigital public performances of sound recordings made by Americans currently are NOT shared with the American performers who create them.

I encourage the administration to ensure inclusion of this protection for American creators in all trade agreements going forward. American music is by far the most listened to in the world, and we should do all we can to ensure our American music creators are treated fairly by our trade partners.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 11, the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Peter Gaynor, to be Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Mr. President, I was necessarily absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 12, confirmation of Peter Gaynor, to be Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

RECOGNIZING THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to commend the Coast Guard men and women who serve in Kodiak, AK, a designated Coast Guard City. On February 7, Kodiak's Chamber of Commerce will hold a community-wide celebration called ''We Applaud You.'' I want to take a moment to join in applauding the Coast Guard as a whole and all the Coast Guard personnel serving in Alaska, but especially those based in Kodiak who help make our great State a safe place to live and work.

Kodiak is a robust Coast Guard City: it is homeport for three cutters, fifteen aircraft, a communications detachment, the North Pacific Regional Fisheries Training Center, the Aids to Navigation Team, and of course, Base Kodiak. Each of these components serve and protect Alaskans on a daily basis, and I would like to highlight some particularly important examples of their contributions and service to Alaska.

Personnel from the Marine Safety Detachment in Kodiak helped oversee and coordinate multiple pollution responses on Kodiak Island last year, including responding to a diesel spill in the Buskin River, and a separate spill of Fuel Oil at Kitoi Bay Hatchery. The Marine Safety Detachment's prompt actions and clean-up expertise helped keep the island of Kodiak's rivers and coastline beautiful and safe. My sincere thanks to Marine Safety Detachment Kodiak.

On New Year's Eve, the search and rescue team, including Air Station Kodiak and the Coast Guard Cutter *Mellon* responded to a sinking fishing vessel, the F/V *Scandies Rose*. The crews faced 40-knot winds, 15–30 foot seas and significantly reduced visibility at the scene of the sinking. The search and rescue team successfully recovered two survivors from a life raft but the five remaining crew members were lost. My heart goes out to the families and friends of those lost at sea. The crew of the *Scandies Rose* is in my prayers; this accident has hit especially close to home for Kodiak, which is a tight-knit fishing community, as well as a Coast Guard City.

As we mourn the loss of the *Scandies Rose*, we are incredibly grateful for the efforts of the Coast Guard to rescue the survivors in the face of extremely dangerous conditions. We see these type of heroic actions in movies, but the Coast Guard in Alaska operates in dangerous, life-threatening conditions every day in order to keep Alaskans safe. To the entire search and rescue team, we applaud you, and Alaska thanks you.

Now, I also want to sincerely thank Base Kodiak, the home of ''Rock Solid Support.'' Your work behind the scenes provides the foundation for all of the ready and responsive work done by those on the front lines. You truly are the rock solid support that keeps things moving, whether it is the medical and dental clinics keeping over a thousand people healthy; the Morale Welfare and Recreation team keeping the crew happy and energized—and in shape—the personnel support staff who recently completed a 5-year effort to increase salaries and close a long overdue pay gap for wage grade members across Alaska; or the facilities engineering department, who have improved living conditions for Kodiak's most junior Coast Guard members by converting housing units to allow two single members to share them.

It is so important to me that our junior Coast Guard men and women are able to enjoy improved housing arrangements while away from home, maybe for the first time. Maybe they will be so comfortable in Kodiak that they want to come back to Alaska and call it home. I applaud all 450 personnel of Base Kodiak who keep the Coast Guard operations going.

Finally, I want to take a minute to speak to the contributions and sacrifice of our Coast Guard families, partners, and spouses. So much of the demanding work that our Coast Guard

men and women do each day is made possible by the love and support of their families. This is especially true when additional burdens are placed on Coast Guard personnel, like we experienced this time last year, when the Coast Guard was left unpaid during the 35-day government shutdown. Here in Congress, I will continue to work with Senator *Sullivan* to pass the Pay Our Coast Guard Act, which will ensure that a lapse in pay from a government shutdown never happens again. Our Coast Guard families deserve nothing less.

Thank you to the Kodiak Chamber of Commerce for their work to honor our Coast Guard members in Alaska. I applaud you as well for your support for those who serve and for taking the time to say thank you and well done to our Coast Guard Family.

20TH ANNIVERSARY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE'S FIRST MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. DAY CELEBRATION

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise today in observance of the 20th anniversary of New Hampshire's first Martin Luther King Jr. Day. After legislation was enacted the previous summer, Martin Luther King Jr. Day in the year 2000 was the culmination of a years-long struggle to add Dr. King's name to the State's official Civil Rights Day holiday. I ask my colleagues and all Americans to join me in celebrating this recognition of such an influential figure and saluting the men and women who prompted this important and permanent change.

This anniversary is personal for me. I fought alongside so many when I served in the New Hampshire State Senate for an appropriate way to honor Dr. King, the preeminent leader of the civil rights movement. Years later, as Governor, I was proud to sign the bill into law that ended New Hampshire's status as the only State not to recognize his birthday as an official holiday. There were setbacks leading up to that triumphant June day, including many failed votes in the State legislature; yet with a sense of resilience typical of the movement that Dr. King inspired, we persevered and kicked off the new millennium in the Granite State by celebrating our first Martin Luther King Jr. Day on January 17, 2000.

It was an exciting time that reflected the positive change that many of us had seen in our lifetimes. As a child growing up in southern Missouri and attending segregated schools, I saw the daily injustices of life under Jim Crow segregation. We have made great strides since then in the march toward full equality, and these advancements are the product of Dr. King's leadership and the peaceful, nonviolent protest movements that he championed.

Whether writing from inside a jail cell or speaking from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, Dr. King delivered a stirring message with hope that Americans could come together and fully realize one of our country's founding principles, that *all* are created equal. He pledged himself and inspired others to work toward a more perfect union and embrace a belief in freedom and opportunity for all. He held a faith that engaged citizens—from the thousands who stood with him on the National Mall in 1963 to the many who worked tirelessly years later to establish a holiday in his name—are the most powerful promoters of positive social and economic change.

One of those engaged citizens was Rev. Dr. Arthur Hilson of New Hope Baptist Church in Portsmouth, NH. A beacon of wisdom and grace, Reverend Hilson was instrumental in garnering the public support to establish Martin Luther King Jr. Day. He understood that the people we choose to revere can send a powerful message to future generations and that the lifework and message of Dr. King must be a part of the heritage we leave to our children. We lost Reverend Hilson last year, but we still hold on to cherished memories of a man who, when asked how he was doing, would always answer, ''Too blessed to complain.'' We are all blessed to have known such a loving neighbor, determined activist and living embodiment of Dr. King's teachings.

On behalf of the people of New Hampshire, I ask my colleagues and all Americans to join in celebrating Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Day and in recognizing Reverend Hilson who was so dedicated to building Dr. King's ''Beloved Community'' of justice, equality and love for all.

RECOGNIZING INDIANA WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE CENTENNIAL

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise to formally recognize an important event that will be occurring in my home State of Indiana this week.

On Thursday, January 16, the Indiana Women's Suffrage Centennial Commission will be hosting a celebration at the Indiana Statehouse to commemorate the 100th anniversary of Indiana ratifying the 19th Amendment. Moreover, the Indiana General Assembly will present a resolution honoring this historic milestone and the Hoosiers who led the way to ensure equal representation for women in their government.

As we celebrate the anniversary, it is important we acknowledge that the record of Hoosiers seeking equal voting rights for women goes back to the 1850s, when Amanda Way, a Winchester native, organized the Indiana Woman's Rights Association and called for its first convention. This act of passionate leadership was just the beginning of a generation-spanning story of determination, sacrifice, and advocacy. Countless women and men followed in Amanda's footsteps and continued to campaign for the betterment of their society and government. Nearly 70 years later, these Hoosiers' tireless efforts led to Indiana becoming the 26th State in the Union to ratify the 19th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, prohibiting States from denying the right to vote on the basis of sex.

The centennial of women's suffrage is an opportunity to highlight Indiana's leadership in uniting communities, tearing down barriers to better relationships, and promoting representative governance. On behalf of all Hoosiers, I wish Indiana continued success as it commemorates and recognizes a proud history of supporting equality and constitutional freedom.

TRIBUTE TO JENNIFER DOUGHERTY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, it is our privilege to pay tribute to Jennifer Dougherty as she prepares to leave her position as a detailee for the Senate Committee on Armed Services and return to her position as a Senior Analyst for the Government Accountability Office.

For the past 12 months, Ms. Dougherty has assisted the committee and its members with high-priority work on contracting reform in the National Defense Authorization Act for 2020 and overseeing implementation of previously enacted acquisition reforms. Her contributions to our committee's work have been significant and highly valued by our members and staff.

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I thank Ms. Dougherty and wish her future success as she continues to support the U.S. Government.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JAMES J. NARAMORE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the outstanding career of Dr. James J. Naramore. For over 40 years, Jim Naramore dedicated his life to caring for the people of Campbell County.

Born and raised in Gillette, he is a graduate of Campbell County High School. He earned an undergraduate degree from John Brown University and earned his medical degree from the University of Utah. He completed his training in family medicine at the University of Nebraska.

Gillette was fortunate when Dr. Naramore came home in 1978 for a temporary position in the emergency department at Campbell County Memorial Hospital. He returned permanently in 1980 and spent the rest of his career practicing at Family Health in Gillette, while also serving on the medical staff of the hospital.

In addition, Dr. Naramore understood the importance of helping others enter the medical profession. Throughout his career, he taught and mentored the next generation of Wyoming physicians. He served as an instructor for the Department of Human Medicine at

the University of Wyoming Family Practice residency, a preceptor for the Creighton University School of Medicine, and a preceptor for the physician assistant training program for both Creighton University and the University of Washington. He has also been active in teaching emergency medical technician classes. Finally, Dr. Naramore also has served as president of the Campbell County Medical Society, as well as serving on the Physician Advisory Council to the Wyoming Board of Medicine.

For Dr. Naramore, practicing family medicine in Gillette was more than a profession. As a Gillette native, he understood the importance of giving back to his community. Throughout his career, he dedicated countless hours to making a real difference in his hometown. Dr. Naramore participated in the Gillette Area Leadership Institute, served on the board of directors of the Campbell County Chamber of Commerce, and was president of the Razor City Toast Masters.

Finally, Dr. Naramore has served as president of Campbell County Medical Society, as well as serving on the Physician Advisory Council to the Wyoming Board of Medicine. In addition, he held numinous positions at Campbell County Memorial Hospital, including chairman of the Bylaws Committee, chief of the Family Practice Department, chief of the Department of Medicine, a member of the Credentials Committee, the Critical Care Committee. Most importantly he served as the hospital's chief of staff.

In 2019, Campbell County Healthcare Foundation recognized Jim's contributions with their Outstanding Healthcare Award. Certainly, Jim's years of service to the health of Gillette and Campbell County made him an outstanding choice for this honor.

With that being said, Jim Naramore is most proud of his outstanding family. His wife Karen has been at his side for over 47 years. Together they raised four children: Lindsay, Marissa, Jessica, and Marcus. Now they are enjoying their six grandchildren.

Mr. President, it is my honor to recognize the outstanding career of Dr. James Naramore. Wyoming is fortunate to have physicians like Jim who go above and beyond to improve the health of their community.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:15 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 629(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Speaker appoints the following individuals to the Board of the Federal Judicial Center Foundation on the part of the House of Representatives for a term of 5 years: Ms. Elizabeth J. Cabraser of Sebastopol, California and Mr. Peter A. Kraus of Dallas, Texas.

At 5:36 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Johnson, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, announced that the House of Representatives has impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors Donald John Trump, President of the United States; the House of Representatives adopted articles of impeachment against Donald John Trump, which the managers on the part of the House of Representatives have been directed to carry to the Senate; and Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CROW, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas, have been appointed such managers.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 755, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, DECEMBER 18, 2019

Resolved, That Donald John Trump, President of the United States, is impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors and that the following articles of impeachment be exhibited to the United States Senate:

Articles of impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives of the United States of America in the name of itself and of the people of the United States of America, against Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America, in maintenance and support of its impeachment against him for high crimes and misdemeanors.

ARTICLE I: ABUSE OF POWER

The Constitution provides that the House of Representatives ''shall have the sole Power of Impeachment'' and that the President ''shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors''. In his conduct of the office of President of the United States—and in violation of his constitutional oath faithfully to execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed—Donald J. Trump has abused the powers of the Presidency, in that:

Using the powers of his high office, President Trump solicited the interference of a foreign government, Ukraine, in the 2020 United States Presidential election. He did so through a scheme or course of conduct that included soliciting the Government of Ukraine to publicly announce investigations that would benefit his reelection, harm the election prospects of a political opponent, and influence the 2020 United States Presidential election to his advantage. President Trump also sought to pressure the Government of Ukraine to take these steps by conditioning official United States Government acts of significant value to Ukraine on its public announcement of the investigations. President Trump engaged in this scheme or course of conduct for corrupt purposes in pursuit of personal political benefit. In so doing, President Trump used the powers of the Presidency in a manner that compromised the national security of the United States and undermined the integrity of the United States democratic process. He thus ignored and injured the interests of the Nation.

President Trump engaged in this scheme or course of conduct through the following means:

(1) President Trump—acting both directly and through his agents within and outside the United States Government—corruptly solicited the Government of Ukraine to publicly announce investigations into—

(A) a political opponent, former Vice President Joseph R. Biden, Jr.; and

(B) a discredited theory promoted by Russia alleging that Ukraine—rather than Russia—interfered in the 2016 United States Presidential election.

(2) With the same corrupt motives, President Trump—acting both directly and through his agents within and outside the United States Government—conditioned two official acts on the public announcements that he had requested—

(A) the release of $391 million of United States taxpayer funds that Congress had appropriated on a bipartisan basis for the purpose of providing vital military and security assistance to Ukraine to oppose Russian aggression and which President Trump had ordered suspended; and

(B) a head of state meeting at the White House, which the President of Ukraine sought to demonstrate continued United States support for the Government of Ukraine in the face of Russian aggression.

(3) Faced with the public revelation of his actions, President Trump ultimately released the military and security assistance to the Government of Ukraine, but has persisted in openly and corruptly urging and soliciting Ukraine to undertake investigations for his personal political benefit.

These actions were consistent with President Trump's previous imitations of foreign interference in United States elections.

In all of this, President Trump abused the powers of the Presidency by ignoring and injuring national security and other vital national interests to obtain an improper personal political benefit. He has also betrayed the Nation by abusing his high office to enlist a foreign power in corrupting democratic elections.

Wherefore President Trump, by such conduct, has demonstrated that he will remain a threat to national security and the Constitution if allowed to remain in office, and has acted in a manner grossly incompatible with self-governance and the rule of law. President Trump thus warrants impeachment and trial, removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

ARTICLE II: OBSTRUCTION OF CONGRESS

The Constitution provides that the House of Representatives ''shall have the sole Power of Impeachment'' and that the President ''shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors''. In his conduct of the office of President of the United States—and in violation of his constitutional oath faithfully to execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed—Donald J. Trump has directed the unprecedented, categorical, and indiscriminate defiance of subpoenas issued by the House of Representatives pursuant to its ''sole Power of Impeachment''. President Trump has abused the powers of the Presidency in a manner offensive to, and subversive of, the Constitution, in that:

The House of Representatives has engaged in an impeachment inquiry focused on President Trump's corrupt solicitation of the Government of Ukraine to interfere in the 2020 United States Presidential election. As part of this impeachment inquiry, the Committees undertaking the investigation served subpoenas seeking documents and testimony deemed vital to the inquiry from various Executive Branch agencies and offices, and current and former officials.

In response, without lawful cause or excuse, President rump directed Executive

Branch agencies, offices, and officials not to comply with those subpoenas. President Trump thus interposed the powers of the Presidency against the lawful subpoenas of the House of Representatives, and assumed to himself functions and judgments necessary to the exercise of the ''sole Power of Impeachment'' vested by the Constitution in the House of Representatives.

President Trump abused the powers of his high office through the following means:

(1) Directing the White House to defy a lawful subpoena by withholding the production of documents sought therein by the Committees.

(2) Directing other Executive Branch agencies and offices to defy lawful subpoenas and withhold the production of documents and records from the Committees—in response to which the Department of State, Office of Management and Budget, Department of Energy, and Department of Defense refused to produce a single document or record.

(3) Directing current and former Executive Branch officials not to cooperate with the Committees—in response to which nine Administration officials defied subpoenas for testimony, namely John Michael ''Mick'' Mulvaney, Robert B. Blair, John A. Eisenberg, Michael Ellis, Preston Wells Griffith, Russell T. Vought, Michael Duffey, Brian McCormack, and T. Ulrich Brechbuhl.

These actions were consistent with President Trump's previous efforts to undermine United States Government investigations into foreign interference in United States elections.

Through these actions, President Trump sought to arrogate to himself the right to determine the propriety, scope, and nature of an impeachment inquiry into his own conduct, as well as the unilateral prerogative to deny any and all information to the House of Representatives in the exercise of its ''sole Power of Impeachment''. In the history of the Republic, no President has ever ordered the complete defiance of an impeachment inquiry or sought to obstruct and impede so comprehensively the ability of the House of Representatives to investigate ''high Crimes and Misdemeanors''. This abuse of office served to cover up the President's own repeated misconduct and to seize and control the power of impeachment—and thus to nullify a vital constitutional safeguard vested solely in the House of Representatives.

In all of this, President Trump has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and subversive of constitutional government, to the great prejudice of the cause of law and justice, and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States.

Wherefore; President Trump, by such conduct, has demonstrated that he will remain a threat to the Constitution if allowed to remain in office, and has acted in a manner grossly incompatible with self-governance and the rule of law. President Trump thus warrants impeachment and trial, removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 798, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JANUARY 15, 2020

Resolved, That Mr. Schiff, Mr. Nadler, Ms. Lofgren, Mr. Jeffries, Mrs. Demings, Mr. Crow, and Ms. Garcia of Texas are appointed managers to conduct the impeachment trial against Donald John Trump, President of the United States, that a message be sent to the Senate to inform the Senate of these appointments, and that the managers so appointed may, in connection with the preparation and the conduct of the trial, exhibit the articles of impeachment to the Senate and take all other actions necessary, which may include the following:

(1) Employing legal, clerical and other necessary assistants and incurring such other expenses as may be necessary, to be paid from amounts available to the Committee on the Judiciary under applicable expense resolutions or from the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives.

(2) Sending for persons and papers, and filing with the Secretary of the Senate, on the part of the House of Representatives, any pleadings, in conjunction with or subsequent to, the exhibition of the articles of impeachment that the managers consider necessary.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 3193. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–3753. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a letter reporting Antideficiency Act (ADA) Violations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–3754. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Community Reinvestment Act Regulations'' (RIN1557–AE72) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3755. A communication from the Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, a policy statement entitled ''Policy Statement on Compliance Aids'' received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3756. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustments'' (12 CFR Part 1083) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs .

EC–3757. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Portable Air Conditioners'' ((RIN1904–AD02) (10 CFR Parts 429 and 430)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2020; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3758. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Commercial Packaged Boilers'' ((RIN1904–AD01) (10 CFR Part 431)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2020; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3759. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Uninterruptible Power Supplies'' ((RIN1904–AD69) (10 CFR Part 430)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2020; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3760. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Air Compressors'' ((RIN1904–AC83) (10 CFR Parts 429 and 431)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2020; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3761. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Notice regarding the 2020 optimal standard mileage rates'' (Notice 2020–5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3762. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Update to Revenue Procedure 2019–4'' (Notice 2020–4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3763. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Treasury Decision (TD): Chapter 4 Regulations Relating to Verification and Certification Requirements for Certain Entities and Reporting by Foreign Financial Institutions'' (RIN1545–BN73) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3764. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Investing in Qualified Opportunity Funds'' (RIN1545–BP04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3765. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, to Norway to support the manufacture, production, test, and inspection of vertical tail control surfaces and conventional edges, composite subassemblies, and structural parts for the F–35 JSF aircraft in the amount of $100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 19–061); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3766. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, to the UK to support the design, development, assembly, testing, qualification, manufacture, and repair of various parts and components used to manufacture the Joint Strike Fighter LiftSystem in the amount of $100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 19–025); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3767. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to

section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of firearms, parts, and components abroad controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions List of 9mm semi-automatic pistols to Thailand in the amount of $1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 19–051); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3768. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2020–04, Small Entity Compliance Guide'' ((48 CFR Chapter 1) (FAC 2020–04)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3769. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Trade Agreements Thresholds'' ((48 CFR Parts 22, 25, and 52) (FAC 2020–04)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3770. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2020–04, Introduction'' ((48 CFR Chapter 1) (FAC 2020–04)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–175. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey urging the United States Congress and the President of the United States to enact legislation prohibiting airlines from counting breast milk or breast pumps against the airline's carry-on limit and prohibiting airlines from restricting passengers from carrying breast milk onto the aircraft; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NO. 244

Whereas, More than 80 percent of mothers breastfeed their infants during the first six months of the child's life; and

Whereas, No matter what they are doing or where they are, breastfeeding mothers need to express milk every few hours in order to keep up their milk supply and to prevent infection known as mastitis; and

Whereas, On October 5, 2018, the President of the United States signed into law a five-year reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration, which included language that requires airports to provide lactation rooms that are accessible to the public; and

Whereas, In spite of this federal law and laws in all 50 states that specifically allow breastfeeding in any public or private location, breastfeeding mothers have continued to face barriers, even harassment, when breastfeeding or attempting to breastfeed in public places; and

Whereas, The Transportation Security Administration (TSA) permits breast pumps and breast milk for infants or toddlers in reasonable quantities to pass through the security checkpoint in airports; and

Whereas, TSA also permits ice packs, freezer packs, frozen gel packs, and other accessories required to cool breast milk to pass through the security checkpoint in airports; and

Whereas, In spite of these TSA policies, some airlines still prevent passengers from carrying breast milk onto aircraft or prevent breastfeeding mothers from carrying breast pumps onto aircraft by counting breast pumps against the airline's carry-on limits; and

Whereas, There is no federal law that prohibits an airline from counting breast milk or breast pumps against the airline's carry-on limit or restricting passengers from carrying breast milk onto aircraft; and

Whereas, These airline policies create barriers for parents to feed infants and toddlers while traveling and create health risks for breastfeeding mothers who are prevented from expressing milk for extended periods of time while traveling; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House urges the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a law prohibiting an airline from counting breast milk or breast pumps against the airline's carry-on limit or restricting passengers from carrying breast milk onto aircraft.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate and United States House of Representatives, and each member of the United States Congress elected from this State.

POM–176. A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, California, urging the United States Congress to enact H.R. 763 The Energy and Carbon Dividend Act of 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

POM–177. A resolution adopted by the Common Council of Hammond, Indiana, supporting the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and the Dream Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

Report to accompany S. 1739, a bill to enable projects that will aid in the development and delivery of related instruction associated with apprenticeship and preapprenticeship programs that are focused on serving the skilled technical workforce at the National Laboratories and certain facilities of the National Nuclear Security Administration, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–205).

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 227. A bill to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–206).

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled ''Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2020'' (Rept. No. 116–207).

By Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2971. A bill to amend and reauthorize the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GRASSLEY, (from the Committee on Finance), and on behalf of Mr. Alexander (from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions), Mr. Barrasso (from the Committee on Environment and Public Works), Mr. Shelby (from the Committee on Appropriations), Mr. Risch (from the Committee on Foreign Relations), Mr. Wicker (from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation), and Mr. Enzi (from the Committee on the Budget), jointly, without amendment:

H.R. 5430. An act to implement the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada attached as an Annex to the Protocol Replacing the North American Free Trade Agreement.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. RISCH for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

John Hennessey-Niland, of Illinois, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Palau.

Nominee: John Hennessey-Niland.

Post: Republic of Palau.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: Julie Hennessey-Niland, None.

3. Children and Spouses: Connor Hennessey-Niland, None; Aidan Hennessey-Niland, None (no spouses).

4. Parents: John Niland—Deceased; Julia Niland—Deceased.

5. Grandparents: John Niland—Deceased; Katherine O'Brien—Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: James Niland: $1.00, 02/03/2017, ACTBLUE; $5.00, 02/03/2017, ACTBLUE; $5.00, 02/03/2017, Dibble for Congress; $250.00, 01/18/2017, Dibble for Congress; $80.00, 06/09/2015, American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees (AFSCME); $160, 05/13/2015, AFSCME; $160.00, 04/10/2015, AFSCME; $160.00, 03/17/2015, AFSCME; $500.00, 03/02/2015, Minnesota Democratic Farmer Labor Party; $160.00, 02/13/2015, AFSCME. Elizabeth Nerud (spouse), none. Thomas Niland, none (no spouse).

7. Sisters and Spouses: Deirdre Washburn, none; Tom Washburn (spouse): $20, 08/01/2016, Donald J. Trump for President, Inc. Collette Niland: $25, 06/27/2019, ACTBLUE; $10, 04/13/2019, ACTBLUE; $27.50, 02/13/2019, ACTBLUE; $10, 11/04/2018, ACTBLUE; $5, 06/30/2018, ACTBLUE; $22, 03/31/2016, ACTBLUE.

Donald Wright, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Republic of Tanzania.

Nominee: Donald John Wright.

Post: Tanzania.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:
1. Self: None in last 5 yrs.
2. Spouse: $250.00, 2–7–18, Josh Hawley. Katherine Wright: $250.00, 10–7–18, Josh Hawley.
3. Children and Spouses: None.
4. Parents: Deceased.
5. Grandparents: Deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: No Brothers.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Anna Langley: $100.00, Summer 2019, Joe Biden; Walter Langley: None; Debra Veazey: None; Randy Veazey: None.

Dorothy Shea, of North Carolina, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Lebanese Republic.

Nominee: Dorothy Camille Shea.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to the Lebanese Republic.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, donee:
1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: N/A.
3. Children and Spouses: N/A.
4. Parents: Audrey Martin Shea: (Deceased for more than four years); Brandan Bowler Shea, Sr.: (Deceased for more than four years); John Lexcen: (Deceased for more than four years) (stepfather); Ralph Amos Mawyer: None (Deceased) (stepfather).
5. Grandparents: Dennis Clement Shea: (Deceased for more than four years); Marie Shea: (Deceased for more than four years); Camille Martin: (Deceased for more than four years); Patrick Martin: (Deceased for more than four years).
6. Brothers and Spouses: Brandan Bowler Shea, Jr.: None. June Shea (separated): None. Martin Dennis Shea: $25.00, 09/25/2015, Act Blue; $10.00, 03/08/2016, Act Blue; $10.00, 03/08/2016, Patty Judge for Iowa. Lilian Shea (ex wife) $300.00, 06/27/2019, John Walsh for Colorado. Stephen Fennessy Shea: $27.00, 08/08/2019, Act Blue (314 Action Fund); $25.00, 08/08/2019, Act Blue (Amy McGrath); $25.00, 08/08/2019, Act Blue (Jaime Harrison); $25.00, 07/31/2019, Act Blue (Dan McCready); $25.00, 07/05/2019, Act Blue (Cal Cunningham); $25.00, $25.00, 06/19/2019, Act Blue (Roy Cooper); $25.00, 06/19/2019, Act Blue (Cal Cunningham); $20.20, 06/03/2019, Act Blue (Seth Moulton); $1.00, 04/13/2019, Act Blue (Julian Castro); $3.00, 04/05/2019, Act Blue (Jay Inslee); $25.00, 03/30/2019, Act Blue (Jay Inslee).

Anne Shea (wife): $35.00, 09/20/2019, Act Blue (Elizabeth Warren); $25.00, 06/02/2019, Act Blue (Elizabeth Warren); $3.00, 04/05/2019, Act Blue (Jay Inslee); $25.00, 03/30/2019, Act Blue (Jay Inslee); $25.00, 02/22/2019, Act Blue (Dan McCready); $25.00, 10/05/2018 ,Act Blue; $37.00, 12/02/2016, Hillary for America.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Kathleen Ann Shea: None; Margaret Shea Burnham: None; Ashley Burnham (husb): None.

Todd C. Chapman, of Texas, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federative Republic of Brazil.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

Nominee: Todd Crawford Chapman.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to the Federative Republic of Brazil.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons, except as noted below, to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:
1. Self: Todd Chapman, None.
2. Spouse: Janetta Chapman, None.
3. Children and Spouses: Joshua Chapman (son), None; Jason Chapman (son), None; Brooke Danielle Chapman (wife of Jason), None.
4. Parents: Bob Chapman (father, deceased 2007); Marilyn Chapman (mother, deceased 2016).
5. Grandparents: Willie May and William Chapman, Hulda and Walther Thieme (all four grandparents deceased for over 25 years).
6. Brothers and Spouses: No brothers.
7. Sisters and Spouses: My sisters and their spouses do not choose to be in communication with me on such matters. A review of the FEC records shows political contributions only by Ava Chapman within the last five years. Ava Michelle Chapman (sister): $5.00, 2/22/2018, ACTBLUE–Virginia; $5.00, 10/14/2018, ACTBLUE–Virginia; $25.00, 10/14/2018; ACTBLUE–Virginia. Bonnie Neighbour (spouse of Ava), none; Shawn Chapman French (sister), none; Jerry French (spouse of Shawn), none.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 3194. A bill to establish a program ensuring access to accredited continuing medical education for primary care physicians and other health care providers at Federally-qualified health centers and rural health clinics, to provide training and clinical support for primary care providers to practice at their full scope and improve access to care for patients in underserved areas; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 3195. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to review the records of former members of the Armed Forces who die by suicide within one year of separation from the Armed Forces and to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit a report on the REACH VET program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3196. A bill to conserve global bear populations by prohibiting the importation, exportation, and interstate trade of bear viscera and items, products, or substances containing, or labeled or advertised as containing, bear viscera, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 3197. A bill to revoke or deny visas to Chinese officials involved in the formulation or execution of a policy that prevents innocent United States citizens from leaving China; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 3198. A bill to authorize a pilot program to expand and intensify surveillance of self-harm in partnership with State and local public health departments, to establish a grant program to provide self-harm and suicide prevention services in hospital emergency departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions .

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 3199. A bill to amend section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to ensure appropriate compensation for certain hours of overtime work by border patrol agents; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. SMITH, Ms. MCSALLY, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 3200. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit high deductible health plans to provide chronic disease prevention services to plan enrollees prior to satisfying their plan deductible; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 470. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President and the Secretary of State should ensure that the Government of Canada does not permanently store nuclear waste in the Great Lake Basin; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. Res. 471. A resolution authorizing the taking of a photograph in the Chamber of the United States Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. Res. 472. A resolution commending the Louisiana State University Tigers football team for winning the 2020 College Football Playoff National Championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. Res. 473. A resolution congratulating the University of Charleston men's soccer team for winning the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division II Men's Soccer Championship at Highmark Stadium in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. Con. Res. 34. A concurrent resolution affirming the importance of religious freedom as a fundamental human right that is essential to a free society and protected for all people of the United States under the Constitution of the United States, and recognizing the 234th anniversary of the enactment of the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 39

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr.

PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 39, a bill to provide that Members of Congress may not receive pay after October 1 of any fiscal year in which Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget and passed the regular appropriations bills.

S. 117

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 117, a bill to prohibit discrimination against individuals with disabilities who need long-term services and supports, and for other purposes.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 578, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

S. 642

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 642, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Master Sergeant Rodrick ''Roddie'' Edmonds in recognition of his heroic actions during World War II.

S. 762

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 762, a bill to provide for funding from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund for all Federal Aviation Administration activities in the event of a Government shutdown, and for other purposes.

S. 778

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 778, a bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to conduct coastal community vulnerability assessments related to ocean acidification, and for other purposes.

S. 849

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 849, a bill to provide for the inclusion on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall of the names of the lost crew members of the U.S.S. Frank E. Evans killed on June 3, 1969.

S. 892

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 892, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the women in the United States who joined the workforce during World War II, providing the aircraft, vehicles, weaponry, ammunition, and other materials to win the war, that were referred to as ''Rosie the Riveter'', in recognition of their contributions to the United States and the inspiration they have provided to ensuing generations.

S. 933

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 933, a bill to improve data collection and monitoring of the Great Lakes, oceans, bays, estuaries, and coasts, and for other purposes.

S. 1088

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1088, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to require the President to set a minimum annual goal for the number of refugees to be admitted, and for other purposes.

S. 1257

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1257, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand tax-free distributions from individual retirement accounts to include rollovers for charitable life-income plans for charitable purposes.

S. 1258

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1258, a bill to prohibit the sale of tobacco products to individuals under the age of 21.

S. 1757

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1757, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1762

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1762, a bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to provide the Attorney General with greater authority to promote enforcement and disclosure requirements for agents of foreign principals, and for other purposes.

S. 1908

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1908, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 2112

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2112, a bill to enhance the rights of domestic workers, and for other purposes.

S. 2216

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2216, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to formally recognize caregivers of veterans, notify veterans and caregivers of clinical determinations relating to eligibility for caregiver programs, and temporarily extend benefits for veterans who are determined ineligible for the family caregiver program, and for other purposes.

S. 2233

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2233, a bill to nullify the effect of the recent executive order that requires Federal agencies to share citizenship data.

S. 2246

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2246, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide equal coverage of in vitro specific IgE tests and percutaneous tests for allergies under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2321

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2321, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the establishment of Negro Leagues baseball.

S. 2417

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2417, a bill to provide for payment of proceeds from savings bonds to a State with title to such bonds pursuant to the judgment of a court.

S. 2496

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Washington

(Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2496, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the Medicare and disability insurance benefits waiting periods for disabled individuals.

S. 2774

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2774, a bill to direct the Attorney General to establish and carry out a Veteran Treatment Court Program.

S. 2918

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2918, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a program to provide grants to carry out activities to benefit pollinators on roadsides and highway rights-of-way, including the planting and seeding of native, locally-appropriate grasses and wildflowers, including milkweed, and for other purposes.

S. 2949

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2949, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to eligible organizations to provide service dogs to veterans with severe post-traumatic stress disorder, and for other purposes.

S. 2970

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2970, a bill to improve the fielding of newest generations of personal protective equipment to the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 3020

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3020, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with States or to award grants to States to promote health and wellness, prevent suicide, and improve outreach to veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 3152

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 3152, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to incorporate data on maternal health outcomes into its broadband health maps.

S.J. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 6, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

S.J. RES. 68

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 68, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

S. RES. 306

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 306, a resolution reaffirming the commitment to media diversity and pledging to work with media entities and diverse stakeholders to develop common ground solutions to eliminate barriers to media diversity.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 3198. A bill to authorize a pilot program to expand and intensify surveillance of self-harm in partnership with State and local public health departments, to establish a grant program to provide self-harm and suicide prevention services in hospital emergency departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as we all know too well rates of suicide have risen to epidemic levels in the United States, with suicide now the 10th leading cause of death in the country. On average, there are 129 suicides every day, roughly one every 11 minutes—a staggering statistic. That is why I am pleased to be introducing bipartisan, bicameral legislation to provide new resources to help turn the tide on this increasingly dire situation. I am joined in introducing the Suicide Prevention Act by Senator KENNEDY, with Representatives CHRIS STEWART and DORIS MATSUI introducing companion legislation in the House of Representatives.

This legislation would authorize new funding for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, to partner with the State and local health departments to improve surveillance of suicide attempts and other incidences of self-harm. Current data collection efforts regarding suicide are often years after the fact, which limits the ability of State and local health departments, as well as community organizations, to recognize trends early and intervene. This new effort would enhance data collection and sharing, as appropriate, in real time to help save lives.

Recognizing that emergency healthcare providers are at the frontlines of responding to suicide attempts, this bill would authorize funding for a grant program within the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, SAMHSA, to fund suicide prevention programs in emergency departments, ED, to better train staff in suicide prevention strategies, screen at-risk patients, and refer patients to appropriate followup care. The legislation would also require SAMHSA to develop best practices for such programs, so that healthcare providers are able to provide their patients with the best possible care and advice. Approximately 37 percent of individuals without a previous history of mental health or substance abuse who die by suicide make an ED visit within the year before their death. According to the Suicide Prevention Resource Center, the risk of suicide is greatest within a month of discharge from the hospital.

In 2017, 47,173 Americans lost their lives to suicide. That same year, there were 1.4 million suicide attempts. We must renew our efforts on suicide prevention. In 2004, working with my colleague Senator GORDON SMITH of Oregon, we authored the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act. This law authorized new youth suicide prevention programs in honor of Senator SMITH's, son, who tragically died by suicide just a couple of weeks short of his 22nd birthday. For over a decade, these programs have funded college campus, State, and Tribal efforts to prevent suicide among our youth and young adult populations, who are particularly at risk of suicide. During this time, youth suicide rates have decreased significantly in my home State of Rhode Island, however, nationwide, suicide rates have skyrocketed over the last decade. That is why we must renew our attention and focus on suicide prevention, including by increasing funding for and access to the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline. This effort is critical to ensuring that when people in crisis call looking for help, someone will be there on the other end of the line to offer hope and counseling. I have also worked with my colleagues Senators GARDNER, BALDWIN, and MORAN on legislation to designate the Lifeline as an easy to remember, 3-digit number, 9-8-8. This common sense legislation would make it easier for people across the country to access the Lifeline when they really need it. I am glad the Federal Communications Commission, FCC, taking steps to make the 9-8-8 number a reality, which makes increasing funding for the Lifeline all the more vital.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to partner with Senator KENNEDY once again by introducing the Suicide Prevention Act today. I look forward to working together with our other sponsors and colleagues, as well as stakeholders supporting these efforts, to pass this critical legislation.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. SMITH, Ms. MCSALLY, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 3200. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit high deductible health plans to provide chronic disease prevention services to plan enrollees prior to satisfying their plan deductible; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3200

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Chronic Disease Management Act of 2020''.

SEC. 2. CHRONIC DISEASE PREVENTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 223(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E) and by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

''(D) PREVENTIVE CARE SERVICES AND ITEMS FOR CHRONIC CONDITIONS.—For purposes of subparagraph (C), preventive care shall include any service or item used to treat an individual with a chronic condition if—

''(i) such service or item is low-cost,

''(ii) in regards to such service or item, there is medical evidence supporting high cost efficiency of preventing exacerbation of the chronic condition or the development of a secondary condition, and

''(iii) there is a strong likelihood, documented by clinical evidence, that with respect to the class of individuals utilizing such service or item, the specific service or use of the item will prevent the exacerbation of the chronic condition or the development of a secondary condition that requires significantly higher cost treatments.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to coverage for months beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 470—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE PRESIDENT AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE SHOULD ENSURE THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA DOES NOT PERMANENTLY STORE NUCLEAR WASTE IN THE GREAT LAKE BASIN

Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 470

Whereas the water resources of the Great Lakes Basin are precious public natural resources shared by the Great Lakes States and the Provinces of Canada;

Whereas, since 1909, the United States and Canada have worked to maintain and improve the water quality of the Great Lakes through water quality agreements;

Whereas more than 40,000,000 individuals in both Canada and the United States depend on the fresh water from the Great Lakes for drinking water;

Whereas Ontario Power Generation is proposing to build a permanent deep geological repository for nuclear waste less than 1 mile from Lake Huron in Kincardine, Ontario, Canada;

Whereas the Government of Canada is proposing to build a permanent deep geological repository for high-level nuclear waste in the Great Lakes Basin;

Whereas nuclear waste is highly toxic and can take tens of thousands of years to decompose to safe levels;

Whereas a spill of nuclear waste into the Great Lakes, including during transit to a permanent deep geological repository for nuclear waste, could have lasting and severely adverse environmental, health, and economic impacts on the Great Lakes and the individuals who depend on the Great Lakes for their livelihoods;

Whereas more than 187 local, county, State, and Tribal governments have passed resolutions in opposition to the proposed nuclear waste repository of Ontario Power Generation;

Whereas Tribes and First Nations' citizens have a strong spiritual and cultural connection to the Great Lakes;

Whereas the protection of the Great Lakes is fundamental to treaty rights; and

Whereas, during the 1980s, when the Department of Energy was studying potential sites for a permanent nuclear waste repository in the United States in accordance with the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.), the Government of Canada expressed concern with locating a permanent nuclear waste repository within shared water basins of the 2 countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Government of Canada should not allow a permanent nuclear waste repository to be built within the Great Lakes Basin;

(2) the President and the Secretary of State should take appropriate action to work with the Government of Canada to prevent a permanent nuclear waste repository from being built within the Great Lakes Basin; and

(3) the President and the Secretary of State should work together with their counterparts in the Government of Canada on a solution for the long-term storage of nuclear waste that—

(A) is safe and responsible; and

(B) does not pose a threat to the Great Lakes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 471—AUTHORIZING THE TAKING OF A PHOTOGRAPH IN THE CHAMBER OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 471

Resolved,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION FOR PHOTOGRAPH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph 1 of Rule IV of the Rules for the Regulation of the Senate Wing of the United States Capitol (prohibiting the taking of pictures in the Senate Chamber) shall be temporarily suspended for the sole and specific purpose of permitting an official photograph to be taken on January 16, 2020, of the swearing in of Members of the United States Senate for the impeachment trial of the President of the United States.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate is authorized and directed to make the necessary arrangements to carry out subsection (a), which arrangements shall provide for a minimum of disruption to Senate proceedings.

SENATE RESOLUTION 472—COMMENDING THE LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY TIGERS FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2020 COLLEGE FOOTBALL PLAYOFF NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. CASSIDY submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 472

Whereas, on Monday, January 13, 2020, the Louisiana State University Tigers football team (referred to in this preamble as the ''Louisiana State University Fighting Tigers'') won the 2020 College Football Playoff National Championship (referred to in this preamble as the ''National Championship'') with a 42 to 25 victory over the third-ranked Clemson University Tigers at the Mercedes-Benz Superdome in New Orleans, Louisiana;

Whereas that victory is the first college football national championship that the Louisiana State University Fighting Tigers have won since the 2007 season;

Whereas the Louisiana State University Fighting Tigers completed an undefeated season for the first time since 1958, finishing the 2019 season with 15 wins and 0 loses;

Whereas the Louisiana State University Fighting Tigers finished the National Championship game with 628 yards of total offense;

Whereas, with the National Championship victory, quarterback and 2019 Heisman Trophy Winner Joe Burrow capped off one of the greatest seasons for a player in college football history;

Whereas Patrick Queen was named the defensive Most Valuable Player of the National Championship game;

Whereas Joe Burrow was named the offensive Most Valuable Player of the National Championship game;

Whereas wide receiver Justin Jefferson from Destrehan, Louisiana, rated as a ''three star'' player while being recruited out of high school, has shown that he is one of the best wide receivers in college football;

Whereas safety Grant Delpit won the Thorpe Award, which recognizes the best defensive back in college football;

Whereas, with 1,780 receiving yards, Ja'Marr Chase set a new Louisiana State University record for receiving yards;

Whereas running back Clyde Edwards-Helaire from Baton Rouge, Louisiana, made big plays throughout the entire 2019 season, including in the National Championship game;

Whereas the Louisiana State University Fighting Tigers offensive line won the Joe Moore Award as the best offensive line unit in college football;

Whereas head coach of the Louisiana State University Fighting Tigers and Larose, Louisiana, native Ed Orgeron has shown incredible leadership throughout his time at Louisiana State University;

Whereas the Louisiana State University Fighting Tigers showed incredible sportsmanship and teamwork throughout the entire 2019 season; and

Whereas the Louisiana State University Fighting Tigers have made the people of Louisiana proud: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the Louisiana State University Tigers football team (referred to in this resolution as the ''Louisiana State University Fighting Tigers'') for winning the 2020 College Football Playoff National Championship;

(2) recognizes the many achievements of the coaches, players, and staff of the Louisiana State University Fighting Tigers;

(3) recognizes the fans of the Louisiana State University Fighting Tigers and the people of Louisiana for their dedication and support; and

(4) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the head coach of the Louisiana State University Fighting Tigers, Ed Orgeron;

(B) the interim President of Louisiana State University, Tom Galligan; and

(C) the Athletic Director of Louisiana State University, Scott Woodward.

SENATE RESOLUTION 473—CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF CHARLESTON MEN'S SOCCER TEAM FOR WINNING THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION II MEN'S SOCCER CHAMPIONSHIP AT HIGHMARK STADIUM IN PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 473

Whereas, on December 14, 2019, the University of Charleston men's soccer team won the National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as the ''NCAA'') Division II Men's Soccer Championship at Highmark Stadium in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, which was the second national championship in 3 years for the University of Charleston;

Whereas the University of Charleston men's soccer team finished its historic season with a record of 22 wins, 2 losses, and 1 tie by securing a victory over California State University, Los Angeles in the national championship;

Whereas the University of Charleston men's soccer team has become a symbol of pride and success to the University of Charleston and the surrounding communities in West Virginia;

Whereas the University of Charleston men's soccer team held its opponents scoreless in 17 of 25 matches in 2019, with goalkeeper Alvaro Unanua Dean registering 11 shutouts;

Whereas Alvaro Unanua Dean was recognized as the 2019–2020 NCAA Division II statistical champion for Goals Against Average and Save Percentage;

Whereas the University of Charleston men's soccer team earned the 2019–2020 Division II men's soccer statistical championship title for Goals Against Average and Shutout Percentage;

Whereas the University of Charleston men's soccer team won the championship in the first and third seasons with Dan Stratford as head coach;

Whereas the University of Charleston men's soccer team outscored its opponents 87–8 over the course of the 2019 season, led by Freddy Tracey with 14 goals, including 6 game-winning goals, one of which was in the national championship;

Whereas Ettore Ballestracci was ranked fourth nationally in NCAA Division II players with the most assists, with 12 assists throughout the 2019 season;

Whereas All-Atlantic Region First Team players Williams D'Nah and Jordi Ramon, who shut out their NCAA Division II Tournament opponents in 5 out of 6 matches, anchored the defense of the top-ranked University of Charleston men's soccer team;

Whereas the University of Charleston men's soccer team finished the 2019 season with 12 consecutive wins, cruising to its sixth straight Mountain East Conference regular season title, second consecutive MEC tournament championship, and fifth NCAA Division II Men's Soccer Atlantic Region title in 6 seasons;

Whereas Christopher Allan was named Most Outstanding Defensive Player, and Freddy Tracey was named Most Outstanding Offensive Player;

Whereas Christopher Allan, Freddy Tracey, Williams N'Dah, and Alvaro Unanua Dean were named to the All-NCAA National Championship Tournament Team; and

Whereas the University of Charleston men's soccer team should be praised for the historic season of both athletic and academic accomplishments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the University of Charleston men's soccer team for winning the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division II Men's Soccer Championship;

(2) recognizes the athletic program at the University of Charleston for its achievement in both sports and academics; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate prepare an official copy of this resolution for presentation to—

(A) the University of Charleston for appropriate display;

(B) the President of the University of Charleston; and

(C) the head coach of the University of Charleston men's soccer team.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 34—AFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AS A FUNDAMENTAL HUMAN RIGHT THAT IS ESSENTIAL TO A FREE SOCIETY AND PROTECTED FOR ALL PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, AND RECOGNIZING THE 234TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENACTMENT OF THE VIRGINIA STATUTE FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 34

Whereas the democracy of the United States is rooted in the fundamental truth that all people are created equal, endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights, including life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;

Whereas the freedom of conscience was highly valued by—

(1) individuals seeking religious freedom who settled in the colonies in the United States;

(2) the founders of the United States; and

(3) Thomas Jefferson, who wrote in a letter to the Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church at New London, Connecticut, dated February 4, 1809, that ''[n]o provision in our Constitution ought to be dearer to man than that which protects the rights of conscience against the enterprizes of the civil authority'';

Whereas the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom was—

(1) drafted by Thomas Jefferson, who considered the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom to be one of his greatest achievements;

(2) enacted on January 16, 1786; and

(3) the forerunner to the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

Whereas section 2(a) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6401(a)) states that—

(1) ''[t]he right to freedom of religion undergirds the very origin and existence of the United States''; and

(2) religious freedom was established by the founders of the United States ''in law, as a fundamental right and as a pillar of our Nation'';

Whereas the role of religion in society and public life in the United States has a long and robust tradition;

Whereas individuals who have studied the democracy of the United States from an international perspective, such as Alexis de Tocqueville, have noted that religion plays a central role in preserving the Government of the United States because religion provides the moral base required for democracy to succeed;

Whereas, in Town of Greece v. Galloway, 134 S. Ct. 1811 (2014), the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed that ''people of many faiths may be united in a community of tolerance and devotion'';

Whereas the principle of religious freedom ''has guided our Nation forward'', as expressed by the 44th President of the United States in a Presidential proclamation on Religious Freedom Day in 2011, and freedom of religion ''is a universal human right to be protected here at home and across the globe'', as expressed by that President of the United States on Religious Freedom Day in 2013;

Whereas ''[f]reedom of religion is a fundamental human right that must be upheld by every nation and guaranteed by every government'', as expressed by the 42nd President of the United States in a Presidential proclamation on Religious Freedom Day in 1999;

Whereas the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States protects—

(1) the right of individuals to freely express and act on the religious beliefs of those individuals; and

(2) individuals from coercion to profess or act on a religious belief to which those individuals do not adhere;

Whereas ''our laws and institutions should not impede or hinder but rather should protect and preserve fundamental religious liberties'', as expressed by the 42nd President of the United States in remarks accompanying the signing of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 2000bb et seq.);

Whereas, for countless people of the United States, faith is an integral part of every aspect of daily life and is not limited to the homes, houses of worship, or doctrinal creeds of those individuals;

Whereas ''religious faith has inspired many of our fellow citizens to help build a better Nation'' in which ''people of faith continue to wage a determined campaign to meet needs and fight suffering'', as expressed by the 43rd President of the United States in a Presidential proclamation on Religious Freedom Day in 2003;

Whereas, ''[f]rom its birth to this day, the United States has prized this legacy of religious freedom and honored this heritage by standing for religious freedom and offering refuge to those suffering religious persecution'', as noted in section 2(a) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6401(a));

Whereas Thomas Jefferson wrote—

(1) in 1798 that each right encompassed in the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States is dependent on the other rights described in that Amendment, ''thereby guarding in the same sentence, and under the same words, the freedom of religion, of speech, and of the press: insomuch, that whatever violated either, throws down the sanctuary which covers the others''; and

(2) in 1822 that the constitutional freedom of religion is ''the most inalienable and sacred of all human rights'';

Whereas religious freedom ''has been integral to the preservation and development of the United States'', and ''the free exercise of religion goes hand in hand with the preservation of our other rights'', as expressed by the 41st President of the United States in a Presidential proclamation on Religious Freedom Day in 1993; and

Whereas we ''continue to proclaim the fundamental right of all peoples to believe and worship according to their own conscience, to affirm their beliefs openly and freely, and to practice their faith without fear or intimidation'', as expressed by the 42nd President of the United States in a Presidential proclamation on Religious Freedom Day in 1998: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) on Religious Freedom Day on January 16, 2020, honors the 234th anniversary of the enactment of the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom; and

(2) affirms that—

(A) for individuals of any faith and individuals of no faith, religious freedom includes the right of an individual to live, work, associate, and worship in accordance with the beliefs of the individual;

(B) all people of the United States can be unified in supporting religious freedom, regardless of differing individual beliefs, because religious freedom is a fundamental human right; and

(C) ''the American people will remain forever unshackled in matters of faith'', as expressed by the 44th President of the United States in a Presidential proclamation on Religious Freedom Day in 2012.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 5 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committes are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 15, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing in executive session.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 15, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing in executive session.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 15, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 15, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 15, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my fellow Nitza Sola-Rotger have privileges of the floor for the balance of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE: REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for the 2019 fourth quarter Mass Mailing report is Monday, January 27, 2020. An electronic option is available on Webster that will allow forms to be submitted via a fillable PDF document. If your office did no mass mailings during this period, please submit a form that states ''none.''

Mass mailing registrations or negative reports can be submitted electronically at http://webster.senate.gov/secretary/mass__ mailing__ form.htm or delivered to the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, D.C. 20510–7116.

The Senate Office of Public Records is open from 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. (9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. when the Senate is not in session). For further information, please contact the Senate Office of Public Records at (202) 224–0322.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 336, H.R. 133.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 133) to promote economic partnership and cooperation between the United States and Mexico.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''United States-Mexico Economic Partnership Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States and Mexico have benefitted from a bilateral, mutually beneficial partnership focused on advancing the economic interests of both countries.

(2) In 2013, Mexico adopted major energy reforms that opened its energy sector to private investment, increasing energy cooperation between Mexico and the United States and opening new opportunities for United States energy engagement.

(3) On January 18, 2018, the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs at the Department of State stated, ''Our exchange programs build enduring relationships and networks to advance U.S. national interests and foreign policy goals . . . The role of our exchanges . . . in advancing U.S. national security and economic interests enjoys broad bipartisan support from Congress and other stakeholders, and provides a strong return on investment.''.

(4) According to the Institute of International Education, in the 2015–2016 academic year, more than 56,000 United States students studied in other countries in the Western Hemisphere region while more than 84,000 non-United States students from the region studied in the United States, but only 5,000 of those United States students studied in Mexico and only 16,000 of those non-United States students were from Mexico.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to continue deepening economic cooperation between the United States and Mexico;

(2) to seek to prioritize and expand educational and professional exchange programs with Mexico, including through frameworks such as the 100,000 Strong in the Americas Initiative, the Young Leaders of the Americas Initiative, Jóvenes en Acción (Youth in Action), the Fulbright Foreign Student Program, and the Fulbright Visiting Scholar Program; and

(3) to promote positive cross-border relations as a priority for advancing United States foreign policy and programs.

SEC. 4. STRATEGY TO PRIORITIZE AND EXPAND EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS WITH MEXICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall develop a strategy to carry out the policy described in section 3, to include prioritizing and expanding educational and professional exchange programs with Mexico through frameworks such as those referred to in section 3(2).

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) encourage more academic exchanges between the United States and Mexico at the secondary, post-secondary, and post-graduate levels;

(2) encourage United States and Mexican academic institutions and businesses to collaborate to assist prospective and developing entrepreneurs in strengthening their business skills and promoting cooperation and joint business initiatives across the United States and Mexico;

(3) promote energy infrastructure coordination and cooperation through support of vocational-level education, internships, and exchanges between the United States and Mexico; and

(4) assess the feasibility of fostering partnerships between universities in the United States and medical school and nursing programs in Mexico to ensure that medical school and nursing programs in Mexico have comparable accreditation standards as medical school and

nursing programs in the United States by the Accreditation and Standards in Foreign Medical Education, in addition to the Accreditation Commission For Education in Nursing, so that medical students can pass medical licensing board exams, and nursing students can pass nursing licensing exams, in the United States.

(c) BRIEFING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall brief the appropriate congressional committees regarding the strategy required under subsection (a).

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 6. SUNSET PROVISION.

This Act shall remain in effect until December 31, 2023.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 133), as amended, was passed.

REAFFIRMING THE SUPPORT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH SUDAN AND CALLING ON ALL PARTIES TO UPHOLD THEIR COMMITMENTS TO PEACE AND DIALOGUE AS OUTLINED IN THE 2018 REVITALIZED PEACE AGREEMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 338, S. Res. 371.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 371) reaffirming the support of the United States for the people of the Republic of South Sudan and calling on all parties to uphold their commitments to peace and dialogue as outlined in the 2018 revitalized peace agreement.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic and an amendment to the preamble to strike the preamble and insert the part printed in italic:

Whereas the people and Government of the United States have a deep and abiding interest in South Sudan's democratic development and post-conflict stabilization;

Whereas the United States was a critical partner in the drafting and implementation of the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement that laid the groundwork for the 2011 referendum on self-determination, through which the people of South Sudan overwhelmingly voted for independence;

Whereas the United States recognized South Sudan as a sovereign, independent state on July 9, 2011;

Whereas, since the onset of the civil war in South Sudan in December 2013, nearly 400,000 South Sudanese citizens are estimated to have been killed, 1,900,000 have been internally displaced, and 2,300,000 have fled the country and registered as refugees;

Whereas violence erupted in Juba in July 2016 and spread throughout the country in violation of the August 17, 2015, Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in the Republic of South Sudan (ARCSS);

Whereas the Revitalized Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in the Republic of South Sudan (R-ARCSS), signed on September 12, 2018, affirmed the Parties' commitment to the permanent ceasefire, humanitarian access, and respect for human rights, and established two phases of implementation, an 8-month Pre-Transitional Period followed by a 36 month Transitional Period that includes the establishment of a Revitalized Transitional Government of National Unity (RTGoNU), and calls for elections 60 days prior to the end of the Transitional Period to establish a democratic government;

Whereas the R-ARCSS stipulates that the signatories will create an enabling political, administrative, operational, and legal environment for the delivery of humanitarian assistance and civilian protection;

Whereas two extensions to the deadline to form the RTGoNU have been granted to allow additional time to complete critical Pre-Transitional tasks, including agreement on the number and boundaries of states and important security arrangements;

Whereas the United States Department of State 2018 Country Report on Human Rights Practices in South Sudan states that both the government and opposition forces engaged in serious human rights abuses by perpetrating extrajudicial killings, including ethnically based targeted killings of civilians, and by engaging in arbitrary detentions, torture, rape, beatings, and looting of property;

Whereas, on March 15, 2019, the United Nations Security Council extended the mandate of the United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) for one year and authorized UNMISS to use all necessary means to deter violence against civilians, to prevent and respond to sexual and gender-based violence, and to foster a secure environment for the return or relocation of internally displaced persons (IDPs) and refugees;

Whereas the people of South Sudan continue to suffer from a humanitarian crisis, despite over $4,500,000,000 in United States humanitarian aid provided since the conflict began, with more than half the population experiencing acute food insecurity at the peak of the lean season in 2019, and humanitarian organizations are providing more than 5,300,000 people with lifesaving assistance and other vital support services, such as medical care to survivors of sexual violence and facilitating access to education to over 690,000 children;

Whereas South Sudan has been at the lowest tier of the Department of State's Trafficking in Persons rankings since 2015, indicating that its government does not fully meet the minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking and is not making significant efforts to do so;

Whereas impunity for past atrocities, corruption, and capture of key sectors of the national economy, such as the oil and mining sectors, continues to drive violence in South Sudan, and signatories to the R-ARCSS committed to the establishment of transitional justice and economic and resource management measures;

Whereas the United Nations Security Council adopted resolution 2471 on May 30, 2019, to extend its sanctions regime in South Sudan and renew the prohibition of the supply, sale, or transfer to South Sudan of arms and related material or the provision of training, technical, and financial assistance related to military activities or materials until May 31, 2020; and

Whereas peace and security in South Sudan is critical to peace and security in East Africa: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

That the Senate—

(1) supports a sustainable peace and democracy in South Sudan;

(2) calls on the incumbent government and all other signatories of the R-ARCSS to—

(A) take concrete and meaningful steps to create an enabling environment, to include security arrangements for Juba and the unification of forces, for all relevant stakeholders to participate actively in the formation of the RTGoNU and South Sudan's democratic development and post-conflict stabilization;

(B) take immediate action to resolve peacefully the remaining political issues for negotiation during the Pre-Transitional Period, including agreement on the number and boundaries of states;

(C) adhere to the cessation of hostilities and ensure humanitarian access;

(D) immediately release all political prisoners and fulfill their responsibility to protect civilians;

(E) ensure respect for the right to freedom of expression, association, and peaceful assembly; and

(F) cease recruitment and immediately release all child soldiers under the command or influence of the South Sudan People's Defense Forces (SSPDF) and its associated militias;

(3) calls on heads of state of member countries of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development in East Africa to engage South Sudanese leaders and parties to uphold their commitments to the peace agreement, including maintaining the cease-fire, to make good-faith progress toward peacefully forming the RTGoNU, and to resolve other key issues;

(4) calls on the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to—

(A) intensify bilateral and multilateral diplomatic efforts to demonstrate the commitment of the United States to helping achieve a permanent and sustainable peace in South Sudan on par with its commitment to ameliorate the suffering of the South Sudanese people;

(B) elevate and consult additional voices in South Sudan to broaden the constituency and shared responsibility for maintaining peace and fulfilling the commitments of the Pre-Transitional and Transitional periods; and

(C) continue to support civilians, particularly women and children, who have been adversely affected by the civil war, and provide assistance to meet humanitarian needs and support peacebuilding, conflict prevention, transitional justice, and reconciliation efforts led by local civil society;

(5) urges the Secretary of State and the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to monitor implementation of the UNMISS mandate authorized by United Nations Security Council Resolution 2459 (2019) and ensure that any return or relocation of IDPs from United Nations Protection of Civilian sites are safe, informed, voluntary, dignified, and conducted in coordination with humanitarian actors;

(6) urges the Secretary of State, in conjunction with the Secretary of the Treasury to continue to monitor human rights abuses and corruption in South Sudan and take decisive action using authorities granted under the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note);

(7) urges the Secretary of the Treasury to exercise all options to prevent, detect, investigate, and mitigate money laundering activities; and

(8) supports implementation and subsequent renewal of the United Nations Security Council arms embargo in South Sudan to prevent continued illicit acquisition of arms and military equipment by all parties and the proliferation of weapons throughout the country.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment to the resolution be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the resolution, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on the adoption of the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to; that the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 371), as amended, was agreed to, and the preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

COMMENDING THE LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY TIGERS FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2020 COLLEGE FOOTBALL PLAYOFF NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 472, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 472) commending the Louisiana State University Tigers football team for winning the 2020 College Football Playoff National Championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 472) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF CHARLESTON MEN'S SOCCER TEAM FOR WINNING THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION II MEN'S SOCCER CHAMPIONSHIP AT HIGHMARK STADIUM IN PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 473, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 473) congratulating the University of Charleston men's soccer team for winning the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division II Men's Soccer Championship at Highmark Stadium in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 473) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 2020

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it adjourn until 9:45 a.m., January 16; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 5430 under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators HOEVEN and CRAMER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from North Dakota.

RECOGNIZING THE NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY BISON FOOTBALL TEAM

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the North Dakota State University Bison football team, and I am really excited to be able to do that. Last weekend, the Bison capped another impressive football season by winning their eighth FCS national title in 9 years. The Bison broke their own record for the most FCS titles of all time, eight in the last 9 years—an unbelievable accomplishment.

They have now won 16 NCAA football championships. NDSU just had a truly impressive team this year, and they just have a tremendous program, as they have demonstrated year after year.

I had the chance to be in Frisco last weekend with Bison Nation. They have an incredible following. We call them ''Bison Nation'' because they go wherever the football team goes, and they make a lot of noise. I had the opportunity to be there with them and cheer on the team as they faced off against James Madison University, the Dukes. It was a hard-fought win for the Bison, and the Dukes should also be congratulated. They have a great program—a first-class program—and great fans. I talked to a lot of them. They could not have been not only more supportive of their team, but they could not have been more complimentary of the Bison and their great program. Again I just want to say: James Madison, a real great program and a real class act—their team, their program, and their fans. Kudos to them as well.

It was just a great effort by our team all around. Just a few stats: The win by the Bison on Saturday capped off an unbeaten season of 16–0. That is the first time a Division I team has gone 16–0, unbeaten, since Yale did it in 1894—pretty remarkable, a pretty amazing accomplishment.

You also have to realize that that brings their current winning streak to 37 consecutive games, so they finished the year unbeaten, and they are now up to a 37-game winning streak.

Next year, the second game of the season, we go to Oregon and play Oregon at Oregon. That should be a really exciting game. It just shows the caliber of football this team plays and just how great these student athletes are. They are great young men as well. I am very pleased that I was joined by my colleague Senator CRAMER in sponsoring this resolution, so I certainly want to express my appreciation to him as well.

We recognize and we congratulate the players, including freshman quarterback Trey Lance, who became the first player in the history of the North Dakota State Bison football team and the first freshman player in history—the first freshman player—to win the Walter Payton Award. It is the first time a freshman has ever done so, which just shows you what a great player he is and is just indicative of the kind of athletes we have on that team.

We want to congratulate and honor the whole team. It was truly a team effort, a great team, led by Coach Matt

Entz and his staff. This is Matt Entz's first year as head coach—what a way to start off for Matt and what a great guy and what a great coach. Also, the athletic director, Matt Larsen, again, just runs a class program of not only football but all of the athletics at North Dakota State University, as well as, of course, the fine leadership of NDSU president Dean Bresciani at the university there, a good friend and somebody who has done a great job leading the university.

Again, I also want to honor Bison Nation. The game was nationally televised on Saturday at noon eastern time here on ABC. It wasn't just our great team; it was Bison Nation, all the fans being there and showing up in such a great way, too, with not only wearing the green and yellow and Bison regalia but cheering and just doing a great job like Bison Nation always does.

We are so proud of the program, so proud of the student athletes, the coaches, and Bison Nation as a whole. We want to congratulate everybody on another incredible year and an unbelievable achievement: eight championships in 9 years.

With that, there is only one other thing to say: Go Bison.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The Senator from North Dakota.

RECOGNIZING THE NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY BISON FOOTBALL TEAM

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I thank the President for yielding the floor and thank you for your previous speech. It is a great honor for me to follow the senior Senator from North Dakota, Senator HOEVEN, in congratulating this remarkable, singular accomplishment by this remarkable, singular football team: the North Dakota State University Bison.

Senator HOEVEN did a great job of highlighting the highlights of this singularly great team as, last weekend, they did win their eighth out of nine FCS national championships; that is, NCAA Division I Football Championship Subdivision.

He went through the statistics that are very impressive: the stretch of 37 victories in a row; the 16–0 season; the singular accomplishment of Trey Lance, this redshirt freshman from Marshall, MN, who threw, by the way, in the course of the season, 29 touchdown passes and a grand total of 0 interceptions—remarkable to say the least. He was just named, in fact, the 2019 FCS National Performer of the Year.

Senator HOEVEN paid tribute appropriately to Coach Entz. Senator HOEVEN is exactly right—an incredible individual; an incredible, undefeated head coach. Not only was he named the Missouri Valley coach of the year, he was just named the AFCA FCS coach of the year—a tremendous person.

We can talk about all the great things that the Bison football team does, and it is appropriate that we do that and that we celebrate them in North Dakota and Fargo and the region and all of Bison Nation, as Senator HOEVEN said. There is something they don't do that I appreciate so much. I watched the game on ABC, as we have watched lots of football games lately on the national networks, and the one thing they don't do that I love is they never point to the name on the back of their jersey because they don't put their names on the backs of the jerseys because this is always a team effort. This is a legacy of a team. It is a culture of a team. It is the equality of a team. As great as every performer is, they are a team. That is the way they win; and, if they ever lose, that is the way they lose, but they don't do that much.

They really have defined—redefined—excellence, but their excellence doesn't end on the field. I don't think it should surprise anybody to learn of a few other statistics of North Dakota State University. For example, just last year, for just the second time in our Division I history, all NDSU athletic teams reached a cumulative grade point average of 3.0. Let me say that again: All NDSU athletic teams reached a cumulative grade point average of 3.0 or greater, while also achieving our highest overall student athlete GPA of 3.43. Over 280 student athletes at NDSU scored a 3.0 or better, with 72—72—of their student athletes receiving a 4.0—earning, I should say, a 4.0.

As you can tell, Senator HOEVEN and I are proud Senators. We are proud of our team. We are proud of our university. We are proud of the entire university system in our State for lots of reasons. I think what the excellence of the North Dakota State University football team has illustrated is an excellence that can be achieved and can be applied not only to the gridiron, not only to the fields of athletic competition, but to life. As the Presiding Officer knows, their motto is that the strength of the herd is in the bison and the strength of the bison is in the herd. It is a good lesson in athletics and a good lesson in life.

I join Senator HOEVEN in congratulating the Bison.

Go Bison.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:45 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:45 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:46 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, January 16, 2020, at 9:45 a.m.